

Cain—an Argument

by E. S. G. Bristowe; (1950)

Argumentation is defined in the *Imperial Dictionary* (1884) as "the operation of inferring propositions not known or admitted to be true, from facts or principles known, admitted or proved to be true; reasoning."

Preface

In presenting this book I should like to call attention to the fact that the material on which my arguments rest comes from two sources: the Bible, and established facts published by well-known writers. When I disagree with certain theories proffered by the said writers, it is because they merely rest upon conjectural ideas; otherwise I would not dare to challenge them.

Although I realise my insignificance in the world of scientific research, I venture to claim that I have found the master key to many problems connected with prehistoric times lying neglected in the Fourth Chapter of Genesis, between the lines, as it were, of the following passage:—

"And Cain said unto the Lord. My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth, and it shall come to pass, that everyone that findeth me shall slay me And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod" (Genesis iv, 13-16).

After finding how many locked doors of the world's ancient history this master key can open, one of my great difficulties has been to make this book small; but my hope is that the reader after weighing my arguments for himself will take the trouble to study the works from which I quote passages, keeping my point of view in mind.

I trust that no author quoted will be offended by anything I have written, but, as St. Jerome wrote: "If an offence come out of the truth, better is it that the offence come, than that the truth be concealed."

Chapter One

"Buy the truth and sell it not."—Proverbs xxiii, 23.

In the following pages which might well be described as one long argumentation I do my best, as in a former book, to impart to others my belief that the prehistoric Babylonian ruler, best known to us as Sargon of Akkad, was Adam's eldest son, Cain. By thus linking up sacred and secular history I hope to refute the theory that, so far as history goes, the first chapters of Genesis are unimportant.

Philologically speaking, the identification of Cain with Sargon seems obvious because the name "Sargon," otherwise rendered Sargina, or Sargani, Shar-Gani-sharri, Sharrukinu, etc., is practically synonymous with "King Cain," the first syllable sar or shar meaning ruler or king in oriental languages, and obviously the origin of Shar, Czar, Sir, Sire, Sahib, etc., while the second syllable, gon, gan, gina, kin or kinu has the same root as Cain. Writing about the name of Adam which is found in Babylonian cuneiform texts, the late George Smith of the British Museum says:

"Several of the other names of antediluvian patriarchs correspond with Babylonian words and roots, such as Cain with Gina and Kinu" (*Chaldean Genesis*, p.295, early edition).

Professor Leonard King wrote in 1910:—

"The finding of early inscriptions of Shar-gani-sharri of Akkad and of tablets dated in his reign removed any tendency to discredit the historical value of later traditions; and the identification of Shar-gani-sharri with the Sargon of Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian scribes ceased to be in question. In fact, if any one point in early Babylonian history was to be certainly established it was the historical character of Sargon of Akkad." (*Sumer and Akkad*, published in 1910).

Thanks to the latest books upon excavations in the Middle East, where the oldest culture known to us has been found, it now seems possible (as it was not when I wrote my former book), to trace the exiled Cain's wanderings down the east side of the River Tigris to the Persian Gulf; his crossing of the Gulf and final settlement on the western bank of the River Euphrates. At present, however, an admittedly conjectural story of prehistoric Babylonia is being offered in which no room is left for an Empire-builder, such as Sargon's inscriptions show him to have been, nor do the (conjectural) dates, now arbitrarily fixed for Sargon, allow his identification with Cain. Hence the argumentative tone of these pages and my temerity in differing from far better known writers than myself. Without Sir Leonard Woolley's fascinating books *Ur of the Chaldees*, *The Ur Cemetery* and others; and without Mr. Patrick Carleton's skilful summary of the archaeological discoveries made in the Middle East before 1939, this book could not have been written.^[1] My constant references to those and earlier writers (the latter including Professors Sayce, Leonard King, Kittel and Dr. Waddell—four of the most untiring decipherers of the cuneiform inscriptions), will I hope be appreciated by anyone really interested in the dawn of history.

Happily for my purpose, the historical status of Sargon of Akkad has been recognised by Assyriologists. In the *Historians' History of the World* (vol. 1, p.360), we read:—

"In his lifetime Sargon was treated as a supernatural being and the words 'Sargon is my god' have been found in cuneiform inscriptions."

Writing in 1887, Professor Sayce says: "In spite of the atmosphere of myth surrounding him, Sargon was an historical monarch and the founder of a great empire."^[2] Dr. Hall of the British Museum, writing in 1912, says: "Few monarchs of the ancient world are so well known to us moderns interested in these subjects as Sargon of Agade ... to the Babylonians he was their hero of heroes, their Menes, Charlemagne or Alfred the Great" (*History of the Near East*, p.186).

In *Sumer and Akkad*, Professor King gives an inscription in which Sargon says that he "poured out his glory over the world."

The title "King of the four quarters of the world" found by the late Professor L. King on cuneiform tablets and applied to Naram-Sin, Sargon's successor prepares us for the magnitude of Sargon's empire, as described by the late Dr. Waddell, who writes of Sargon: "He is seen to have ruled an empire in the ancient world so vast that it has perhaps never been equalled in the old World. It is seen to have included, besides Mesopotamia and the greater part of Asia Minor and Syro-Phoenicia; also Egypt and the Mediterranean basin, Persia and the Indus Valley with the Arabian Sea, and extending beyond the Pillars of Hercules to Britain" (*Makers of Civilisation*, p.198).

Evidently the Babylonians never forgot their great founder though, as will be shown, they carefully disguised him in their mythology. It must have been admiration for the great empire-builder that prompted the usurper of the Babylonian throne in the eighth Century B.C. to take the name of Sargon.^[3]

By proclaiming that the Babylonian city of Erech (or Unuk) in Southern Iraq was the city of Enoch built by Cain, Professor Sayce in 1887, and Dr. Waddell^[4] fifty years later, paved the way, so to speak, for my claim that Sargon of Akkad was Cain, by publishing cuneiform texts in which Sargon says he is King of Erech.

Professor Sayce also encourages, inadvertently, that theory by explaining in the preface to his *Hibbert Lectures*, that throughout Babylonian history the only language spoken in the Euphrates Valley was "Semetic" (the archaeological term for anything akin to Hebrew as Cain's language may naturally be expected to have been.

[5] The Professor remarks, too, that the "Semitic Babylonians" and the Assyrians who later invaded Babylonia in the third millenium B.C. were allied in blood and language to the Hebrews; a pronouncement which encourages my conviction that, while the Babylonians were the nation founded by Cain, the Assyrians were of the race of Noah's son Shem through his second son Assur.[6] This is no mere theory; for one of the Assyrian kings bore the name of Samu-abī ("Shem is my father") [7] (*Historians' History of the World*, vol. 1, p. 363).

According to Genesis x, after the flood in Noah's time, the accepted date for which is about 2350 B.C., Noah's great-grandson Nimrod reigned over the cities of Babylon, Erech and Accad, all of which the Babylonian inscriptions assign to Sargon of Akkad of the previous millenium. Some Bible scholars suggest that Nimrod came to the throne through his mother, who is thought to have been Cain's descendant Naamah and the wife of Ham. This theory can explain much; Nimrod himself was of the accursed line of Ham and is described by ancient Hebrew writers as evil and as hunting men as well as animals. This may account for the further Bible information that "Asshur went forth from Babylon and builded Nineveh"; the possibility being that Asshur was identical with the son of Shem [8] of whom Noah had prophesied that God would dwell "in his tents." A son of Shem might well have made a punitive attack upon the cruel Nimrod, devastated his capital city and built Nineveh, the total disappearance of which, after several centuries of Assyrian rule, is one of the mysteries of ancient history. Its downfall had been foretold, however, by the prophet Nahum and was presumably a divine chastisement; for Babylonian inscriptions reveal the fact that the Assyrian kings adopted the pagan practices of Sargon's reign, although in a modified form, abolishing human sacrifice and the eating of human flesh in honour of the gods.

This glimpse of later Babylonian history may be useful to look back to when reading future pages. Undoubtedly the Assyrians and the Babylonians had become one nation in the time of the kings of Israel and were destined to be the "rod" of God's anger to the disobedient Israelites.

Writing of Asshur-bani-pal, the last of the Assyrian kings, who reigned in Nineveh, and referring to his collection of archaic documents from older Babylonian cities once ruled by Sargon, Professor Sayce says: "The most acceptable to the Assyrian king were the written volumes that the ancient temples and palaces contained No present could be sent to him which he valued more than some old text from Erech, Ur or Babylon (*Hibbert Lectures*, pp 10-12).

How the Professor found this out and what he imagined was the reason for Asshur-bani-pal's predilection, he does not say but to one who identifies Cain with Sargon, who ruled those ancient cities and the Assyrians as a branch of Shem's race, it seems natural that Asshur-bani-pal should have been interested in Sargon's reign.

So far, Sayce encourages my claims; but turning to the subject of the cuneiform, or wedge-shaped, writing of the Babylonian inscriptions and remarking that it was not the invention but the heritage of the Semetic Babylonians, the Professor (adopting a theory evolved by Professor Rawlinson) announces that it was taught, together with other elements of culture, to the Babylonians by an unknown race who entered Iraq before them, were in no wise related to them, and whom, "in default of a better name he would term Accadian or Proto-Chaldeans in his lectures" (*ibid.* p. 5).

This assumption may have seemed to explain certain difficulties met with in Assyriology, but I hope to show that on the contrary it has only added to them. Of course it runs counter to my identification of the earliest Babylonians with Cain and his followers; and, since the recent authors, already referred to, accept the Professor's groundless theory, merely varying the name Accadian with that of "Sumerian," it remains the chief cause of the argumentative nature of this book.

Calling the hypothetical race Sumerians, Mr. Carleton writes:

"The great question of post-war Archæology is: When did this people arrive in Babylonia, and where from? We do not know; all that we can say for certain is that, as early as 3000 B.C., they were firmly established there; that at that remote date they already had a settled and distinctive culture, religion and social organization as well as a command of arts and handiwork which argues a long previous history; in a word their civilization was already mature" (*Buried Empires*, p. 28).

No trace of the evolution of this marvellous culture can be found anywhere. Yet, as one authority wrote some years ago, regarding the earlier discoveries in the Euphrates Valley: "Surely such a people as this could not have sprung into existence as a *Deus ex Machina*; it must have had its history ... a history which presupposes a development of several centuries more (*Historians' History of the World*, p. 356). The expression "*Deus ex machina*," meaning "a god out of a machine," (or some unlikely event) is curiously appropriate in connection with my belief that the prehistoric culture of Sargon's cities of Erech and Ur was the direct outcome of the miraculous knowledge acquired by Adam and Eve from the Tree of Knowledge. It will be shown later that the Babylonians themselves attributed Sargon's superhuman knowledge to his mother's teaching.

The undeniable fact that the cuneiform writing betrays its "Semitic" origin should surely have spared us the Sumerian hypothesis; but, alas, it is favoured by recent writers although some years ago a group of foreign Assyriologists including Joseph Halevy, Friedrich Delitzsch and Hugo Winckler argued convincingly enough that:—

"The earliest characters from which grew the cuneiform system of writing testify to the Semitic origin of that writing and completely refute the hypothesis of early decipherers that there existed on Babylonian soil prior to the Semites an alien race called Sumerians or Akkadians" (*Historians' History of the World*, vol. I, p. 310).

As for the so-called Sumerian texts, M. Halevy declared that their writing was "nothing more than a priestly system of cryptography, based, of course, upon the common phonetic speech (*ibid.*, p. 310).

Dr. Waddell says that the word "Sumer" was used in Babylonia—"Solely as a territorial and never apparently as an ethnic title.^[9] He also quotes Professor Sayce's opinion that "Sumer" was the same word as "Shina" (the Bible name for Babylonia) (*Asiatic Review*, April, 1926).

By implying that the name "Adam" distinguished thinking men from non-thinkers, Philology is again helpful. Professor Sayce wrote "Adam, in Hebrew as in Assyrian, signifies 'man,'" and Professor Max Müller wrote: "'Man' is a derivative root, meaning to think. From this we have the Sanscrit 'Manu.' Under this name the Romans personified intelligence and prudence" (*Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*, Nettleship).

Chapter Two

"Again and again, truth escapes from the prisons made for her by mortal hands."

The above words, (the author's name escapes me) offer the keynote to the following pages—the pendant, as it were, to my former book already mentioned in which I claimed that the Babylonian Sargon of Akkad (or Agade) whose records now lie in the British Museum, was none other than Adam's eldest son, the murderer Cain. By proving that the cities Erech and Ur over which Sargon claimed to rule, were the oldest in the world and that the Babylonian civilisation flourished many centuries before that of Egypt, Science has destroyed many formidable prisons made by mortal hands for truth.

Had only Science deigned to heed the words of the Apostles John and Jude concerning Cain, and those of Josephus and Philo of the first Christian centuries, a master key might, years ago, have been provided to the

astonishing remains excavated in the Euphrates Valley and now preserved in the British and other museums. Had archaeologists identified Sargon of Akkad with Cain and studied what is said about Cain in the fourth chapter of Genesis, they could have solved the problem of the massive buildings buried in Erech and Ur; for the Bible allows us to assume that Cain had sufficient followers to carry out such great works. Cain expresses fear that some unspecified people would slay him: we read: "God placed a mark upon Cain lest any finding him should slay him." And here we meet with the vexed question of pre-Adamites.^[10]

Professor Sayce throws light upon this matter by describing archaic enamelled bricks, dug up in the Middle East, upon which a black race of mankind is portrayed, and commenting: "It may seem that the primitive population of Chaldea was black-skinned" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 185).

Bible students might have expected that signs of a prehistoric, non-Adamite, race would be found in excavating Bible lands for, in Genesis Adam is not presented as the first human being but only as the first "man," (a Hebrew word meaning "thinker") into whom God breathed "a living soul." What Science has found out about the black race indicates that they were the non-thinking race of whom Cain was afraid. An expert writes:—

"In the texture of bone, the architecture of the skull, the nature of the asymmetry of the body and the character of the variations ... in these and many other respects there is evidence of the profound gap that separates the Negro from the rest of mankind" (*Ancient Egyptians*, p. 79).

Another scholar writes that, whereas the white man's brain grows with the expansion of the brain-pan until middle age, the Negro's brain-pan closes up after the age of twelve years (*Ency. Brit.* 11th ed. "Canis", p. 344).

Assyriologists do not connect their prehistoric discoveries with the Bible nor do they identify Sargon with Cain; therefore an incursion into their branch of science is necessary. For, to them, I owe the established facts upon which my arguments are based.

My interference may be pardoned, I hope, in view of the extra interest their discoveries derive from the probability that Sargon of Akkad was Cain. On the other hand the arguments brought forward can scarcely fail to appeal to anyone who agrees with St. Augustine of Hippo's pronouncement that "Christianity began in Genesis," for, as Professor Kittel of Leipzig remarked in a lecture some fifty years ago,^[11] nothing would so effectually silence adverse criticism of the Bible as the discovery that "in the grey dawn of history there were men who possessed the knowledge of God." Sargon's inscriptions show that he possessed that knowledge although he established four false gods, whose titles and attributes prove them to be travesties of Adam, Eve, Abel and Satan, calling them Anu or Abu, Ishshar or Ea, Tammuz or Domuz, and Bel, Mul-lil, Enlil, Nannar, Akki or Sin-the-moon-god. Who, I ask, could this primæval apostate have been but the rebellious Cain of Genesis iv, who dared to answer the Creator's question, "Where is thy brother?", with the audacious words, "Am I my brother's keeper?" In the first epistle of John, Cain is described as "of that wicked one," and in a Babylonian text Sargon proclaims himself "The Divine Sargani, the illustrious king, a son of Bel the Just, the King of Agade, and of the children of Bel" (*The First Bible*, Conder).

In another text, also published by the late Colonel Conder, Sargon says that he has erected a temple for the god "Enlil, King of all lands, to worship Enlil all his life long." The Babylonians' names for the devil, who seems to have been very real to them, were Bel, Enlil, Mul-lil, Nannar, Akki and Sin-the-moon-god.

The "children of Bel" ruled by Sargon were probably the priests, for, as Professor Sayce writes: "Sargon was the first high-priest" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 26).

In one inscription Sargon says that "being the chief ruler of Erech, he wields henceforth the power of them of Ur" (*The First Bible*, p. 218). This suggests to me that he built Ur as a refuge for his devil-worshipping priests as it seems to have remained throughout history.

Possibly the inhabitants of Ur, separated as it seems from Sargon's other subjects, were black people, but if this was so, it was kept secret by the Babylonians; for, in all their statues and carvings, the priests are clearly white people though of a most peculiar type, suggesting wilful caricatures of humanity, quite unlike any known race.

Presumably the Biblical name of Adam, found so unexpectedly in Iraq by the first decipherers of cuneiform, together with pictures of clay seals,^[12] one representing Adam and Eve, the Tree of Knowledge and the Serpent; and another, the Cherubim guarding the Tree of Life, inspired George Smith and Colonel Conder to call their respective books, *The Chaldean Genesis* and *The First Bible*: and considering the linguistic evidence already mentioned it seems strange that neither of them identified Sargon, whose name is actually synonymous with King Cain, for the pictures on the seals betray a grim sense of humour such as rebellious Cain might well have possessed. Adam and Eve, though unmistakably meant for white people, are absurdly ugly and wear horns; while the conventionalised cedar tree with its seven branches, the large pear-shaped fruit and the serpent reared on its tail behind Eve, present a ludicrous picture. Surely truth was knocking vainly at George Smith's mind when he wrote "We know well that in the earliest sculptures none of these figures were chance devices, but presented events, or supposed events, so it is evident that a version of the Fall similar to that of Genesis was known in early times in Babylonia" (*Chaldean Genesis*, p. 55).

The words "supposed events" suggest, of course, that their writer was sceptical about the Genesis story and Colonel Conder's title "The First Bible" indicates his acceptance of the heretical theory that the events and characters recorded in Genesis were inspired by Babylonian myths and legends. This theory, evolved by a group of eminent German scholars, was no doubt strengthened by the then popular idea that the Babylonian cuneiform writing was older than the Hebrew alphabet. Now, however, a more ancient script has been found in the oldest temple at Erech and there is nothing to prove that the cuneiform was not derived from a writing revealed to Adam and Eve in the beginning.

Referring to the recently found script, the latest writer on the subject says: "It is probable that the oldest temple in the world has also yielded the most ancient documents" (*Buried Empires*, p. 50).

In spite of Professor Kittel's bold denouncement of the anti-Biblical theory as being entirely without foundation and "only meant to adduce evidence against the Bible and Christianity," it took root in Germany and when Smith was writing his "Chaldean Genesis," was spreading in Anglo-Saxon countries, permeating Assyriology and influencing Theology. Even prominent churchmen began to make such remarks as "We should regard Adam and Eve not as historical individuals but as Man and Woman" (*Can We Believe?* Canon Gore of Oxford.)

Cain was, however, an historical individual to the late Professor Sayce when, in the course of an argument, he wrote: "If I am right in identifying Unuk (*i.e.* Erech) with the Enoch of Genesis, the city built by Kain in commemoration of his son ..." (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 185).

Presumably Sayce had been influenced by inscriptions on very ancient bricks, dug up at Erech, upon which were found the words: "Unuk, the old City," and "the place of the settlement."^[13] Surely enough to turn the professor's thoughts to Cain and the "Enoch" of Genesis iv. Nor was this all that Sayce discovered; other inscriptions convinced him that the knowledge of The One God reached Babylonia in the beginning of history and that four gods were established at Erech—to quote his words, "The City of Erech was the seat of the gods Anu and Ishtar." Of the third god he writes: "The name of Tammuz probably grew up in the Court of Sargon." Following the German theory he says that Tammuz was the "prototype" of Abel, since he is said to have been born in Eden and to have been a shepherd, killed when young and mourned by Ishtar, who is easily recognised as representing the Biblical Eva (Hebrew—life or life-giving) or Ishshar (meaning "woman" as she was first called by Adam.) Ishtar's countless titles include those of "Lady of Eden," "Goddess of the Tree of Life," "Mother of Mankind," and "Beloved of Anu." A Babylonian legend represents her as descending into Hades to find the murdered Tammuz. Of the fourth god, Sayce says "The supreme Bel was Mul-lil who is called the god

of the lower world; his messengers were nightmares and demons of the night and from whom came the plagues that oppressed mankind" (*ibid.*, p. 147).

Can anyone avoid the conclusion that these four gods were modelled more or less upon the first characters recorded in Genesis, and that Cain, who has no place in this oldest of all pantheons, was its inventor? Could greater offence have been offered to the Creator by this outcast man and his familiar spirit "the father of all lies?"

It seems incredible that Sayce, who traced these gods back to Sargon's court at Erech and identified that city with the Enoch built by Cain, never identified Sargon with Cain although the name Sargon, in all its various forms, is practically synonymous with King Cain. One sees, however, how difficult it would have been for the Professor to go on talking about Cain as the probable builder of Erech while treating Adam, Eve and Abel, in the German way, as mythical beings borrowed from Babylonian literature. One can only attribute to the anti-Christian teaching from Germany, the fact that, instead of crying from the housetops, as it were, his great discovery from Babylonian texts that the knowledge of God had reached the people of the Euphrates Valley in the beginning of history, Professor Sayce wrapped it up, so to speak, in several of his books in dry-as-dust language like the following:

"The conception of the God-head formed the background of the official faith of Babylonia

"The conception of the soul had been arrived at in the age of Sargon of Akkad, the earliest to which at present anything like full contemporaneous records reach back"

"A monotheistic school had flourished which seems never to have had many adherents and eventually died out."

Is it strange that such remarks have passed unnoticed and that when, some fifty years later, Dr. Langdon of Oxford published his conclusion that "Monotheism preceeded Polytheism," it was taken to be a new discovery? Treating it as such the late Sir Charles Marston wrote in 1934, "It seems a conclusion of such far-reaching consequences that there is hardly a modern book written about the Old Testament or about ancient history or archæology in Bible lands which remains unaffected by it (*The Bible is True*).

Here then, was the very discovery that Professor Kittel had pictured to himself, and it has proved the wisdom of Professor Max Müller's affirmation: "The human mind would never have conceived the notion of gods if it had not first of all conceived the notion of God." Professor Kittel quoted his compatriot's words in his lecture as a challenge to Atheism (*Babylonian Excavations*, p. 52). If only, however, Max Müller, had ended his sentence by saying: "Had not God revealed Himself to man in the beginning," or words to that effect, his pronouncement would of course have been more poignant.

So far, however, neither Theology nor Archæology show signs of being affected by Dr. Langdon's discovery. Yet Bible-readers might have expected something of the kind for, in the first chapter of Romans, St. Paul writes of men who in the beginning knew of God, but changed His truth into a lie, and "the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man and to birds, and four footed beasts and creeping things" (Epistle to the Romans, i).

As if in confirmation of the Apostle's words there has been dug up, in Sargon's cities in Southern Iraq, beautifully executed seals on which are depicted human beings with ugly grinning faces and the horns, tails and legs of animals. Photographs of these seals are to be seen in Sir Leonard Woolley's work *The Ur Cemetery*, and in Professor Leonard King's book *Sumer and Akkad*.

So far as I can see, the strange indifference of Christian scholars to the monumental evidence that the knowledge of God existed in the beginning of history can only be put down to the lingering influence of anti-Biblical German writers like Professor Delitzsch who declared as "one having authority," that there can be "no greater

aberration of the human intellect ... than belief in the Divine Revelation of the Old Testament as manifested either in its monotheism, its prophets, or any other respects" (*Babel and Bible*, Lecture II, 1st Edit.).

After quoting Delitzsch's words, Professor Kittel comments:—

"Let us, therefore, briefly inquire ... *sine ira et studio* ... how far we may expect help from the monuments, or how far we may have to regard them as adverse to the Bible As long as we do not expect too much from external or human sources, our hopes will not be readily disappointed."

Let us, therefore, having many established facts to go upon which were unknown in Professor Kittel's time, try to follow his plan of action. For one thing, let us notice how strongly the Babylonian inscriptions happen to support the validity of the Bible records of longevity before the Flood: a matter, which as a great Bible scholar remarks:—

"Is to sincere Christians a tormenting source of mental unrest, and is brought up by anti-Christians triumphantly as a weapon to assail religion" (*The Complete Bible in Modern English*, Ferrar Fenton, F.R.A.S., M.C.A., p. 11).

Unless Sargon of Akkad had lived, like the Bible patriarchs for centuries, he could not have accomplished the stupendous works attributed to him by archæologists; he could hardly have lived less than the 750 years ascribed to Cain by ancient Jewish writers; therefore, to doubt the Bible records of longevity, or for that matter anything recorded in the Bible because it is outside our own experience, is, to say the least, unreasonable.

The Hebrew historian Josephus (38 A.D.) gives a list of ancient authorities who held that "the ancients" lived nearly 1000 years. He reasons:—

"And besides, God afforded them a longer time of life on account of their virtue and the good use they made of it in astronomical and geometrical observations, which would not have afforded the time of foretelling the period of the stars unless they had lived 600 years; for the Great year is completed in that interval."

On enquiring at the British Museum I was told that the 600 years period alluded to by Josephus consists of two of the most satisfactory cycles, that is 300 years, for the calculation of total eclipses. "How," my authority remarked, "the ancient astronomers became aware of these cycles seems to be unknown."

Chapter Three

"Chronology is the Backbone of History."—Flinders Petrie.

Before excavations were made in Southern Iraq, the Egyptian civilisation was thought to be the oldest in the world, (a theory incompatible with the Bible) but, thanks to the latest discoveries, that formidable prison made by mortal hands for truth has been demolished.

Fortunately for my purpose, Sir Leonard Woolley has fixed the date 3500 B.C. for the founding of the royal tombs of Ur, at which time Cain could have been alive, as will be shown presently, judging from three reliable dates in the fourth millenium, to be discussed later.

In *Ur of the Chaldees* (published in 1929), Sir Leonard announced that when the Ur Cemetery was founded, Egypt was still barbarous and that:—

"It is to the prehistoric Babylonians that we can trace much that is at the root not only of Egyptian but also of Babylonian, Assyrian, Hebrew and Phœnician art and thought and so see that the Greeks also were in debt to this ancient and long-forgotten people, the pioneers of western man."

Thus far Archæology takes us and then leaves us in the dark, puzzled by conflicting theories concerning the pioneers of culture and the alternate names, "Semitic-speaking Akkadians" and "Sumerians" which are now applied to them, but free to connect them, if we can, with Cain and his followers.

At first sight, Sir Leonard Woolley seems to support that connection by writing about the pioneers of culture: "It is natural to connect them with the Semitic-speaking Akkadians whom later we find occupying the northern half of the river valley" (*ibid.*). For Sargon's monuments prove that his appearance, language and the foundation of his cuneiform writing were "Semitic" (the modern word meaning akin to Hebrew or Arab), also that he calls himself the "patesi" which means "high priest" of Akkad (a city mentioned in Genesis iv) and claims to have built that city. Then, too, Sir Leonard tells of his discovery, in the Ur Cemetery, of three graves of Sargon's daughters' servants and the Cemetery, he says, was founded in 3500 B.C. and closed down about 3200 B.C., these dates (as will be shown) going far towards identifying Cain as the founder. Sir Leonard explains that the royal tombs were built close to the wall of Ur and in time had been covered by a thick layer of soil and sand thrown up by yearly floodings of the River Euphrates, mixed with debris thrown down by the citizens of Ur. In this layer, he tells us, was the "commoners' cemetery" which, because of the graves of Sargon's daughters, he terms "Sargonid."

"Here," he writes, "no less than three cylinder seals have been found, two of them actually in intact graves and one loose in the soil, bearing inscriptions in which there is added to the owner's name, the statement that he held office in the household of the very daughter of King Sargon ... one was her hairdresser, one her scribe and one her steward" (*ibid.*, p. 110).

Could stronger evidence be needed of the existence of Sargon previous to the building of the Ur Cemetery? Instead, however, of connecting Sargon with the founding of the royal cemetery (as I hope to do later), Sir Leonard writes on the opposite page of his book, "King Sargon reigned from 2630 to 2575 B.C.," thus, so far as I can see, fixing Sargon's reign about 600 years later than 3200 B.C., at which time, he tells us on a previous page (p. 35) the commoners' cemetery was closing down. This seeming anachronism arises, I cannot help thinking, from the arbitrary change of Sargon's monumental date (one of the reliable dates in the fourth millenium already mentioned).

Equally disappointing is it that Sir Leonard, after introducing "Semitic-speaking Akkadians" as the first immigrants into the Euphrates Valley, writes as follows:—

"At a date we cannot fix, people of a new race came into the valley, coming whence, we do not know, and settled down side by side with the old inhabitants" (*ibid.*, p. 19).

"This new race," he continues, "were Sumerians and it is believed that they came into the country with their civilization already formed, bringing with them the knowledge of agriculture, of working in metal and of writing."

"If," Sir Leonard adds, "as our excavations seem to show, there is a great deal of truth in that tradition, then it was not in the Euphrates Valley that the arts were born, and though it is not likely to have been in the Indus Valley either, later research may well discover some site between those two extremes where the ancestor of our Sumerians developed the first real civilization of which we have any real knowledge" (*ibid.*, p. 20).

If only, in the above paragraph, the word "Sumerian" could be replaced by "Adamites" or "Cainites," I should entirely agree with Sir Leonard's last words. As it is, however, Professor Kittel has provided me with greater encouragement by writing of certain Babylonian works of art:—

"They come down to us from the time of Sargon I, and therefore belong, at the latest, to the fourth perhaps even to the fifth millenium before Christ ... they excel moreover, in a considerable measure, much, if not

all, that the later Babylonian workshops have turned out" (*Babylonian and Oriental Excavations*, Kittel, p. 22).

After remarking that these prehistoric works of art "lay the axe to the dogma of evolution," the professor informs us that in the third millenium B.C., there took place a degradation:—

"a species of intellectual impoverishment ... a retrograde movement, and a falling off from a previous higher stage of culture, but which was again approached, and by slow degrees What becomes then of the dogma of a continuous development?" (*ibid.*, pp. 22-23).

Kittel, who never identified Sargon with Cain, left this problem unsolved; but when that identification is made, and the Bible consulted, we can account for the exquisite goldsmiths' work and finely ornamented lyres and gaming-boards found in the Ur Cemetery and now in the British Museum for, in Genesis iv, we read that Cain's great grandson Tubal Cain was "an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron," also that his brother Jubal was "the father of all that handle the harp and organ." It seems natural, too, that after the deaths of Sargon and his famous son, Naram-Sin, Babylonian art should have fallen off; as the age of direct revelation and miracles receded, men's lives grew shorter, as the Bible shows they did, after the flood, and the nation became entirely governed by the priests of Baal, who, according to my beliefs, were the men described by the Apostle Jude as going "in the way of Cain ... raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame ... wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." It was also to Cain and his followers, I believe, that St. Paul alluded in his first epistle to the Romans, as men who knew of God in the beginning but "became fools and changed His truth into a lie," because they "did not like to retain Him in their knowledge."

From the days of ancient Greece, learned men have argued over the origin of mythology. In the last century, Professor Max Müller wrote of the "silly, senseless and savage element which makes it the puzzle men have so long found it," but new light has been thrown upon it now by the deciphering of the Babylonian inscriptions. It seems obvious that it originated with "King Cain" who established his parents and brother as false gods in his city of Erech, his own absence from that oldest pantheon proving it his invention—a gesture, as it were, of bold defiance towards the Almighty who had punished him. Evil mockery and secretiveness may be sensed in the following cuneiform inscription:—

"Istar with Anu the King into a noble seat they raised and in the government of heaven they fixed" (Smith, *Chaldean Genesis*, p. 109).

Mockery can also be detected in the name of "Tammuz" or "Domuz" given to the third god established in Erech, and said by Sayce to be the prototype of Abel and to have lived "in that garden of Edin or Eden which Babylonian tradition placed in the immediate vicinity of Eridu" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 238).

The professor also tells us that "the name of Tammuz probably grew up in the court of Sargon" and surely truth was trying to escape from prison when he wrote those words, for it seems that the original meaning of "Tammuz" was "pig" or "hog," and what but Cain's jealous hatred of his younger brother could have inspired so opprobrious a name for a god?

The late Dr. Ball wrote:—

"The Chinese present us with a series of terms for pig in which both elements of the Accadian Domuzi (pig) are evidently found." (Paper of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.)

Since it is known that the Greeks and Romans borrowed^[14] their myths and legends from the Babylonians, (Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*,) the late Sir James Frazer supports Dr. Ball unintentionally by saying that the beautiful young gods Adonis and Attis were later forms of "Tammuz" (or Domuz,) and were sometimes changed into boars or pigs. "Perhaps," he writes "the cry of 'Hyes Attis, Hyes Attis' which was raised by the worshippers of Attis may be neither more nor less than 'Pig Attis, Pig Attis'" (*Golden Bough*).

That Abel's lovable character was never forgotten in the Middle East is shown by the fact that, in Jerusalem, idolatrous women held a day of mourning every year for "Tammuz" in the outer court of the temple. The wrathful prophet Ezekiel writes: "There sat women weeping for Tammuz" (viii, 14).

In the last century, any attempt to link up the Genesis story with archæological discoveries might have been thought futile, for incredibly early dates were fixed for what is described as "the earliest remains of civilised man," M. de Morgan suggesting 12000 B.C., and M. Pompelly 9000 B.C. Describing, however, such early dates as "outrageous," and almost "astronomical," Mr. Carleton (our latest exponent of prehistoric Babylonia) limits his own suggestion to 4000 B.C., or a few centuries earlier (allowing, no doubt, for a presumed process of evolution.)

This chronological revolution (as it might be called) draws attention to the first page of the Authorised Version of the Bible upon which is printed the date 4004 B.C., calculated two centuries ago by Bishop Usher as the date of Adam's creation, and now supported by science, once its stern opponent. Accepting this approximate date for Adam's creation, and granting that Cain was his eldest son and that he enjoyed the longevity ascribed to other Bible patriarchs before the Flood, it is clear that he could have been reigning in Southern Iraq by 3800 B.C., the approximate date deduced from a statement on a cylinder seal made by the last king of Babylon (6th century B.C.) which is now in the British Museum. Cain could also have founded the royal cemetery of Ur according to the date 3500 B.C. fixed for it by Sir Leonard Woolley, if he lived the 750 years ascribed to him by ancient Jewish historians.

It seems strange that Sargon's fourth millenium date is now ignored, considering that it was unanimously accepted by the first decipherers of the seal. Colonel Conder says: "Sargina the founder of civilisation, lived about 3800 B.C." Professor Sayce, in his *Hibbert Lectures* published in 1887, after saying that the discovery "shook to their foundations" his previous theories, describes how, on the cylinder seal now in the British Museum, Nabonidas, the last king of Babylon (6th century B.C.) tells how he sought for and found the foundation stone of a temple to the sun-god built by Naram-Sin, the son of Sargon, which, he says, had not been seen by any of his predecessors for about 3000 years. The American excavator, Hilprecht, writes:—

"Nabonidas, the last Chaldean ruler of Babylon succeeded in bringing to light the foundation stone of Naram-Sin, the son of Sargon of Agade, which for 3000 years no previous king had seen, conveying to us by this statement the startling news that this great monarch lived about 3790 B.C., a date fully corroborated by my own excavations at Nuffar " (*Excavations in Assyria and Babylon*, p. 273).

The present custom of changing this vitally important date from the fourth to the third millenium B.C. makes it impossible to identify Sargon with Cain if Bishop Ussher's scheme of chronology is accepted; so it seems well to stress the arbitrary nature of the change and this the late Sir Ernest Budge (incidentally) made clear in the *British Museum Catalogue* by writing:—

"It is now generally thought that the scribes of Nabonidas either made a mistake in copying or that there was a mistake in the archetype; in fact they wrote 3200 instead of 2200. We may assume, then, that Sargon reigned between 3000 B.C. and 2700 B.C."

Deploping this arbitrary proceeding another authority writes:—

"It involves the very serious step of scrapping a positive statement made by a king who stood nearly 2500 years nearer than we do to the events he was dating, and whose scribes had doubtless had access to documents which carried them back very much further still" (*The Life of the Ancient East*, p. 107, J. Baikke, 1923).

Dr. Waddell, whose estimate of Sargon's empire has already been mentioned, saw fit to separate Sargon from Cain. Declaring that Cain was the founder of Babylonia and builder of Erech (Enoch) and saying that the "Semites" grossly perverted his history and his noble character, he gives him the approximate date of 3348-3248

B.C., while to Sargon on page 476 of the same work he gives the date "circa 2872 B.C.," at the same time admitting that the date was mere conjecture. He adds:—

"Yet it is upon this admittedly concocted and unsolid basis that all dates of the Sumerian period above and below Sargon's epoch have hitherto been placed" (*ibid.*, p. 476).

Mr. Carleton, too, brings Sargon much nearer our own time, writing that his date "is pretty certainly fixed at round about 2550 B.C." He admits, however, that the priests' lists from which he reckons that date are misleading documents—"disheartening, arbitrary and muddle-headed" (*Buried Empires*, p. 69).

There is no mistaking the influence of the German anti-Biblical school in Dr. Waddell's work. On page 146 of his voluminous book, ^[15] he says that the 'Kan' or 'Gan' of the Babylonian texts was "obviously the historical origin of the 'Cain' of the Hebrew Genesis, and that his father, King Adar or Adda or Addamu was the historical origin of "Adam" of the "Garden of Eden legend of the Hebrew Genesis with his history and character perverted by the Semites." (*Makers of Civilisation*). Thus, as I see things, one of our greatest oriental scholars helped to build up one of the darkest prisons ever made by mortal hands for truth.

Why Dr. Waddell and other writers have chosen to ignore Sargon's monumental date has, I believe, never been explained, but in *The First Bible* by Colonel Conder (page 152), a reason suggests itself. After saying, in two earlier pages of that book, that "the Babylonians regarded Sargon as their founder, creator of wealth and law," and after apparently accepting that claim by describing Sargon in his own words as "the founder of the old Chaldean empire," (p. 28), the Colonel puzzles the reader who accepts the usual date of 2348 B.C. (given in *Cruden's Concordance*) for the Flood in Noah's time, by writing:—

"But it is at least known that the Babylonians believed Sargon to have lived after the Flood; for, in a list of twelve ancient kings, a note is added These are kings who were after the Flood, they have not been arranged in order; and Sargina is among them."

The last words, which are clearly the Colonel's, suggest that he may have fallen into a trap set by priests to obscure their own history, and he may have influenced later writers. Other traps of the kind, however, were set by the 19th century Babylonians, one being the famous "king list" now in the Ashmolean Library at Oxford, the composer of which was the priest Nur-Nin-Subur of about 1900 B.C. According to this list Mr. Carleton says: "There ruled over Babylonia between the Flood and the time of the great King Sargon of Agade, fourteen consecutive dynasties of kings from different cities. His chronicle may be summed up in the following table" (*Buried Empires*, p. 68).

The first line in the list reads:—

"I Dynasty of Kish; 23 Kings reigned for 24,510. years."

The second line reads:—

"I Dynasty of Uruk; 12 Kings reigned for 2,310 years."

After giving the whole list, Mr. Carleton remarks: "Now it is obvious that these figures are misleading." As if trying to make the best of a bad job, however, he adopts Sargon's third millenium date and offers in his book a conjectural story of prehistoric Babylonia, partly inspired by the list in which Sargon is said to have attacked Uruk under its "Sumerian" king, Lugal-Zaggisi, and taken possession of the city. Other scholars, however, have claimed that the "Lugal-Zaggisi," of whose ill treatment by Sargon Mr. Carleton gives quite a circumstantial story, (p. 122,) was only Sargon under another name meaning "great man" or "great lord" (*The First Bible*, p.217. *Worship of the Dead*, p. 399, Garnier).

Surely, the late Dr. Pinches was right in warning us of the desire "to make things as difficult as possible" which he detected in the oldest pagan writings (*Ancient Egypt*, Part 3; edited by Flinders Petrie).

Chapter Four

"Life without enquiry is not worth living."—Socrates.

Needless to say, I welcome Sargon's fourth millenium date which fits in both with Bishop Ussher's date for Adam's creation, and the date now assumed for "the earliest remains of civilised man."^[16] But at this point a difficulty arises, serious enough at first sight, since it involves the authenticity of a leading Bible story, namely that of the Flood in Noah's time.

The difficulty is that Sargon of Akkad is now known to have reigned in Babylon and Akkad, as well as in Erech and Ur; in the *Cambridge History* we read:—

"The Omens place the founding of Akkad soon after Sargon's invasion of the West. He took soil from the outer walls of Babylon and consecrated the boundaries of the holy city of Marduk."^[17] He made it after the model of Babylon" (Vol. 1, p. 407).

In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* we find: "The history of Babylon can now be traced back to the days of Sargon." (11th ed. "Marduk.") No record of Sargon's building of Babylon seems to have been found, but there is reason to think he built it, for Sir Leonard Woolley informs us that the ground plan of the Ziggurat of Babylon, which, he says, became "in Hebrew tradition the tower of Babel," was a repetition on a larger scale of the Ziggurat at Ur; this suggests, of course, that Sargon built both Ziggurats, although Erech and Ur are known to have existed before the Flood and Babylon existed for ages after that event, and here the difficulty presents itself. How if, as I believe, Sargon was Cain and was reigning in Erech and Ur early in the fourth millenium B.C., and if the Flood in Noah's time took place, as Cruden and other Bible scholars tell us, about the year 2350 B.C.; how, I repeat, could Erech, Babylon and Akkad (described in Genesis x as the Kingdom of Noah's grandson, Nimrod) have been built by Cain? For, according to our Bibles, the Flood in Noah's time was universal, destroying the whole earth-surface of the globe; so terrible a visitation must have washed away all Cain's cities before the time of Nimrod. This might have been the reason for the changing of Sargon's date. Happily, however, a more simple way of removing the difficulty exists. The Hebrew word "erets" translated in our Bibles into "earth" or "all the earth," can be quite as correctly rendered "land," "country" or "district," and it is evident that if any one of these words had been chosen instead of "earth" by our translators, the scientifically disproved theory of a universal flood would never have arisen ... we could have pictured Cain's cities in Iraq flourishing on, while in some other land, country or district, the degenerate children of Adam's younger sons were washed away with all their possessions. In Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Bible Knowledge*, a contributor writes, regarding the word "erets":—

"As in many passages it might seem as if the habitable globe were intended, the use of so ambiguous a term as "the earth" should have been avoided, and the original rendered by 'land,' as in Leviticus xxv 23, Isaiah xxiii, and elsewhere."

That the writer of Genesis never meant to teach that the whole earth-surface of the globe was swept away, and only Noah's family in the Ark preserved, can scarcely be doubted. If that had been the case, no explanation could be imagined for the existence of black people (mentioned in both the Bible and Babylonian inscriptions), nor could we account for the pre-Noachian giants, whose descendants alarmed the Israelites in the days of Moses and Joshua. We may conclude that both these races were known to Cain, and that it was because of them, "the Lord put a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him."

Surely the wooden caricatures of Noah's ark with its eight passengers, and wild and domestic animals, must have come from Germany. From those so innocent-seeming toys, Anglo-Saxon children of the 19th century, playing

with them in their nurseries and schoolrooms, received indelible impressions of the Bible story—and what followed? Some of us grew up into incredulous scientists, some into satirical critics of the Old Testament, and others became authors of semi-comic books and plays in which Noah and his sons discussed things with lions and tigers. Dispensing, however, with the notion of a universal flood, we can assume that, though from the beginning wild beasts had roamed in desert places, preying on one another, they had been killed or driven out from the lands inhabited by Adam's sons, and Noah was only commanded to preserve animals useful to mankind.

One is tempted to think that the Hebrew word "Naqi" or "Naqah," used in Job xxii, 16-20, and rendered "guiltless" by Dr. Moffat in his version of the Old Testament, might have been a word more like "Akkadians." Job relates how when floods destroyed "evil men," "good men rejoiced to see their fate, and over them the guiltless jeered, shouting, 'Our foes are now effaced and what they leave the flames will burn.'" It seems easier to picture Sargon of Akkad's people behaving like this (considering that, as we shall see, Sargon is known to have attacked people of his own race)^[18] than to believe that Noah and his family could have been so unfeeling. Nor could Noah and his family have witnessed the fate of the "evil men" after the Ark was closed. And what other spectators could there have been.

As regards pre-adamites, the belief in them may seem contrary to St. Paul's teaching that God "made of one blood all nations of men;" but my belief is that the great Apostle referred only to white men and the word "man" meaning "thinker," first applied to Adam, in Genesis ii, distinguished Adam from the pre-adamites and still distinguishes his race from the black race. Do we, of to-day, ever call a negro a man without using the adjective "black"? In Samuel xix, Isaiah xlv, 8, and Corinthians xvi, 13, the word "man" is used as a distinction, just as we say "Like a man" or "He is a man." In Corinthians I, St. Paul says: "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."

The expression "black race" reminds me that in the famous "Legend of Sargon," that monarch says he reigned over "black-heads" (or "black faces" as George Smith renders the cuneiform words).^[19] One also remembers Dr. Waddell's association of Sargon with the Indus Valley which is called in cuneiform, "the good Edin land" or the "garden of Edin," and the capital of which (excavated in this century) is called Mohenjo-Daro.

The fact that in cuneiform texts the settlement is given the Biblical name of Eden naturally connects it with the Bible, and who but Cain could have built Mohenjo-Dare though the priest-scribes, as usual, obscured things by making out that Sargon conquered it from native rulers; Dr. Waddell translates a cuneiform inscription as follows:—

"King Gina ... the land of the Good Edin City in its might he attacked. They submitted to his arms. And King Gina settled that revolt, and defeated them. He achieved their overthrow and their wide-spreading host he destroyed. And he brought their possessions into Agadu" (*Makers of Civilisation*, p. 219).

I picture therefore, "King Cain" making his way to India "riding in multitudes of bronze chariots over rugged lands," as he says he did in one of his inscriptions, in search perhaps of gold and pearls and imagining how fruitful he could make the banks of the Indus.

The following paragraph suggests Cain's experience gained in building his Babylonian cities of Erech, Ur and Kish, before his conquest of the Indus Valley. Mr. Carleton writes:—

"The city of Mohenjo-Daro in the third millenium B.C. was a PLANNED city like Mannheim in Germany and Bourneville in England. It was the creation of forethought, not of chance. Instead of meandering vaguely intersecting where the spirit moved them ... as did the streets of ancient Ur and Kish, its avenues ran on bold parallels, east to west and north to south as straight as the mason's cord could make them" (*Buried Empires*, pp. 146-147).

On page 145 of *Buried Empires*, the same author speaks of evidence dug up at Ur in the shape of "very extraordinary pottery, certainly imported direct from India," and says there was "a brisk trade between the countries in the age of Sargon." He mentions other finds in Mohenjo-Daro, which connect the city with Sargon, including several of the oldest statues showing the style of hair-dressing peculiar to Sargon's portraits, and countless statuettes of the Mother Goddess wearing a strange head-dress thought by the finders to have once held incense. Another authority, Dr. Mackay, writes:—

"It seems certain that these pottery images of the goddess, whose name is unknown, were kept in every house in the Indus Valley cities, probably in a recess or on a bracket on the wall, which would account for the fact that the figures are nearly all roughly finished at the back" (*Indus Civilisation*).

"Amongst the Hindus to-day," Dr. Mackay says, "the Mother Goddess is the guardian of the house and village, and is altogether closer to her worshippers than any one of the recognised Hindu gods."

In India, the Mother Goddess underwent transformations (as I shall show later she did in Babylonia), becoming the terrible goddess Kali, otherwise called Sitana or Durga. Under the last name, she is represented as riding on a tiger, wearing a wreath of men's skulls, as dispensing smallpox and as the patroness of the murderous "thugs," a Hindu sect now stamped out by the British. As Mr. Carleton says, an idea of the attributes of Kali may be obtained from a view of her many horrifying images in the British Museum. Equally repulsive is the god Shiva who, Mr. Carleton suggests, was Kali's consort, but Dr. Langdon believed (rightly to my mind) was her son; my own conviction being that he was the Indian caricature of Cain. Mr. Carleton writes about him:—

"It does not seem too speculative to identify this important god with the three-headed deity of Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa,^[20] and his consort with the Goddess of whom so many clay figures have been recovered there. If this identification be correct ... as the present writer feels it must be ... then Shiva disputes with Dumuzi (*i.e.* Tammuz who is still worshipped in el-Iraq) the claim to be the oldest living god, for, whilst the oracles of Enlil and Osiris are for ever dumb, millions still worship him under his many names" (*Buried Empires*, p. 164).

Interesting is the thought that Cain (as Shiva) is still worshipped in the East, while in the West, Abel was worshipped (as Tammuz) up to the Christian era. About Shiva, Mr. Carleton says:—

"Many ugly legends are told about this god. He haunts the burning ghats and is depicted as dancing upon a prostrate corpse. The cobra and the tiger are his friends" (p. 163).

Continuing, he says of Shiva and Kali:—

"the bloody and ghastly characteristics of both these deities distinguish them sharply from the gods of the old Aryan pantheon who strongly resemble the Greek Olympians in their mixture of goodwill and indifference towards mankind" (*ibid.*)

Here an explanation seems needed. The tall, fair, blue-eyed Aryans, referred to by Mr. Carleton, whose self-chosen name is connected with "lion" and "noble"^[21] were, I believe, descendants of the Assyrians mentioned in my first chapter, who first conquered Cain's race and were later overcome by it, the two races eventually uniting and composing the terrible nation destined to become, in the first millennium B.C., to the disobedient Israelites, "the rod of God's anger" (Isaiah x, 5).

The date of the "Aryans" arrival in the Indus Valley is uncertain but this much is known from Sanscrit writings: All signs of Sargon's colony had disappeared beneath the sand of countless centuries, and the Aryans treated as vain boasting the dark people's accounts of an ancient glorious past.

The hatred felt by the white men for the dark people is, as Mr. Carleton remarks, (p. 139) understandable for there is evidence that some of them "sacrificed human beings to their sacred tree (the banyan) in a peculiarly

horrible manner."^[22] And here, the same author says, "We come upon a most interesting proof" that this hatred was the basis of the Caste-System, which "even at the present day, is at once the dominant feature of Indian social life and a most fruitful source of discord in that unhappy land."

My suggestion is that the idolatry Cain had established in his city of Erech infected the small black aborigines enslaved by him and they spread the Babylonian customs throughout the Valley of the Indus while the white men he had left in Mohenjo-Daro, becoming degenerate and enfeebled as time went on by the tropical climate, the constant sweat-baths^[23] of which many have been excavated, also intermarriage with the natives, proof of which we now possess, were, in the end, attacked and exterminated by their slaves.

These conjectures are encouraged by Mr. Carleton's account of discoveries made at Mohenjo-Daro, where, he says:—

"The Late period was one of decline ... towards the end of its existence there is evidence that a great catastrophe overtook the city In several places, in streets and chambers, grisly discoveries were made Human skeletons whose limbs, still twisted in attitudes of despair and pain, no hand had ever composed for burial, were found lying as they had fallen at the moment of death The fact that two of the skeletons are headless suggests that it was by invasion, rather than plague that the great city passed finally from splendour to desertion, surrendering its buildings as lairs and the flesh of its proud citizens as food for the jackal and the hyena, and earning the grim native name by which we know it ... Mohenjo-Daro, the Place of the Dead" (*Buried Empires*, pp. 165-166).

Chapter Five

"There were giants in the earth in those days."—Genesis vi, 4.

Turning to Sargon's western empire, I would recall to the reader Dr. Waddell's claim that Sargon "conquered with his hand countries from the rising to the setting sun," especially referring to the Tin-Land of Cornwall. Another author says that Sargon advanced to the Mediterranean ... left there memorials of his deeds, returning home with immense spoils (*Chaldea*, Ragozin, p. 205.)

We find, too, that Professor Winckler believed Sargon made expeditions to "Rhodes, Crete and even to the mainland of Greece itself" (*Sumer and Akkad*, p. 345). In the *Cambridge History* we read: "The omens of Sargon say definitely that he crossed the sea of the west." (Vol. I, p. 405).

Assuming, therefore, that Cain came to these islands in archaic times, we can guess why Avebury, described as the grandest sacred site in Britain, suggests "the form of a serpent passing through a circle," and why two of its huge stones have been known from time immemorial as Adam and Eve.

One may also imagine a link with Cain in the name, "Kennet Avenue," which forms part of the stone serpent, for the letters are practically the root of both Cain and Kennet. It is suggestive, too, that in one part of England seals have recently been dug up inscribed with the sign of the swastika, for, according to Dr. Waddell, that was Sargon's emblem and the Doctor says: "He called himself 'The Nazi of God'" (*Phœnician Origin of the Britons*, p. 273).

That there were giants in Britain in the dawn of history is strongly indicated by the huge figures carved on our chalk downs and clearly visible from the air. They are universally regarded as prehistoric and my belief is that the giants they represent were brought here by Cain to enable him to dig mines and carry out building operations. None but a giant could have moved the huge stones of Avebury and Stonehenge, and none but the super-human Cain could have directed the placing of those relics of the dim past.

In the Old Testament many giants are recorded, the last two being Og, King of Bashan, conquered by Joshua, and Goliath slain by David. The Hebrew word "Rephaim" or "Nephilim" means "monster" as well as "giant" so the terror they inspired in the Israelitish spies may be imagined.

The old chronicler, Geoffrey of Monmouth, relates that, when the first wave of Celts invaded Britain under Brutus, they found "none but a few giants whom they forced to fly into caves of the mountains." One of them, Geoffrey says, was "in stature twelve cubits and of such prodigious strength that at one shake he pulled up an 'oke' as it had been a hazel wand" (*Six Old English Chronicles*, Edited by J. A. Giles, quoted by H. J. Massingham in *Fee, Fi, Fo, Fum*).

According to other old triads and traditions the British Isles were swept early in their history by some kind of plague or flood which exterminated their inhabitants. We might otherwise have feared we were partly descended from Cain, for Herodotus and Thucydides claim that the earliest people of Western Europe were called Knyæ or Kynian or some such name uncomfortably suggestive of Cain.

If Mr. Massingham is right in describing the "wonder beast" on Uffington Hill, in Berkshire, as a dragon, and saying it is contemporary with "Avebury Temple," Cain may well have been the designer; for as St. John says he was "of the evil one" while as "Sargani" he calls himself "the son of Bel the Just," and Professor King writes:—

"Shargani-sharri gave himself the title 'King of Enlil's realm.'"

These grim, self-assumed, titles suggest that Cain gloried in his own wickedness. Only a self-satisfied devil-worshipper could have given himself such names. It is interesting that Cain's son and successor Naram-Sin did not follow his example in this matter but merely claimed to be "King of the four quarters (of the world)." (*Sumer and Akkad*, p. 242) a by-no-means empty title as I shall show later. Commenting upon it Professor Leonard King writes:—

"It is possible that its assumption by Naram-Sin was based on a definite claim to a world-wide empire the full extent of which his predecessor had not enjoyed" (*ibid.*)

Some writers have confused things by describing Naram-Sin as merely a descendant of Sargon, but Professor King who made a special enquiry into this point wrote:—

"There can be little doubt that Shargani-Sharri was succeeded on the throne by Naram-Sin, whom we may regard with considerable confidence as his son as well as his successor (*Sumer and Akkad*, p. 240).

Very usefully, too, Professor King points out how, while the two so-called Semitic Kings, Sargon and Naram Sin, were deified, none of the supposed "Sumerian kings," hundreds of whom are mentioned in the priests' king-lists, were deified, but were only called "patesis" which means "high-priest." My own conviction is that they were mere inventions of the priests intended to obscure true history. Even the author of *Buried Empires*, who composed stories about them, admits the "arbitrary" and "muddle headed" nature of the lists (*Buried Empires*, p. 69).

Naram-Sin's title suggests to me that, while Cain was engaged in exploring the western hemisphere, his son (perhaps after a short reign in Mohenjo-Daro, which city Mr. Carleton writes "carried on a brisk trade with Babylonia in the age of Sargon"), journeyed eastwards with a small army in search of adventure, gold, pearls, and other treasures; also seeking a suitable site for the capital of an eastern empire which should out-rival that of Babylonia.

As said, before, the Aryans, from the west, who reached the Indus Valley about 1500 B.C. could see no trace of former cities there although several existing in Sargon's time were lying buried beneath their feet. Nor, could, of course, the Hindus (coming it is thought from the South) who arrived in the Valley rather later than the Aryans, for it is only in this century that excavations in the Indus Valley have brought to light Sargon's cities built in the

fourth millenium B.C. Taking this fact into account, one is puzzled by Mr. Carleton's remarks referring to the images of the god Siva (or Shiva) and those of the Mother goddess both of which are still worshipped in India and were found in Mohenjo-Daro. He says:—

"Since the ancient Aryan did not worship idols and the modern Hindu does ... it is fair to assume that the custom of image worship was taught the invaders by the older and more civilised inhabitants."

The words "civilised inhabitants" seem to mean the citizens of Mohenjo-Daro and the "invaders" to mean the Hindus, but as we have seen any city built by Cain had been buried by sand and soil long before the Hindus invaded the Valley, even before the arrival of the Aryans who had preceded them. The question arises, therefore, how could the Hindus have learned about the idols dug up recently in Sargon's cities and believed to represent the Mother goddess and her son?

Fortunately Dr. W. J. Perry, Reader in Comparative Religion in Manchester University, helps to answer that question. In his voluminous work *The Children of the Sun*, published in 1923, he writes about people who, at the time of the Aryan invasion, were living in castles on hills near the Indus; he calls them alternatively Asuras, Nagas, or Dravidians and says that the sign upon their banners was a serpent.

My conviction is that the first of these people, some calling themselves "Naga," a word meaning cobra-snake, were descendants of Cain's "sons of his palace" whom he left in his Indian colony when he returned to Babylonia. By the time the Aryans invaded the Valley about the fifteenth century B.C. these Babylonians, holding the aborigines in subjection and taking their daughters as wives, would naturally have acquired characteristics of the dark race and would have taught them something of Cain's artificial religion and his story. One sure sign that the "Asuras," or "Nagas," were Cain's people is that they taught about sky-gods and a home in the sky whither they themselves would go while the dark people at death would go to the "underworld"; a hard and fast doctrine conducive to trouble as the races got more and more mixed. Expressing wonder Dr. Perry writes:—

"The connection which the Assuras have with both the sky and with the underworld needs careful attention Why should ruling groups of Dravidians or Assuras be connected with the sky and the underworld? What is the cause of this duality?" (*Children of the Sun*, p. 172).

More will be said on this subject later; at this point it seems best to consider what the Sanscrit writings have taught scholars about the Assuras. Dr. Perry, for instance, says they were:—

"Far in advance of the Aryans some of their castles were palaces of considerable importance. Added to this wealth and luxury, merchants from the two countries must have met and chattered somewhere in Persia and Beluchistan."

He adds:

"From a monkey, a few beads and a bun of hair we really do seem justified in drawing two major conclusions: that the Indus civilisation existed in substantially the form in which we find it at Mohenjo-Daro, at the time when the royal and priestly graves at Ur were being filled with gold and dead men's bones; and that the Sumerians first came into close contact with it at that time."

Changing the word "Sumerians" into "Cainites," the above words agree with my belief that Cain founded the royal cemetery of Ur and, with his family and courtiers was buried in it. Mr. Carleton says:—

"The problem of those tombs is still to be solved; but it is not inadmissible to speculate on whether something of the impetus which Sumerians undoubtedly received when they were dug may not have been due to contact with a more sophisticated culture, whose home was the valley of the Indus and the broadplain of the Five Rivers" (*Buried Empires*, p. 162).

The reader may have realised that my speculations differ much from those of Mr. Carleton, grateful though I am for all his invaluable information. The Hindus, to whom authorities sometimes credit the civilisation of India, are not easy to trace, but according to the *Waverley Encyclopædia* ("Hindu Chronology," p. 162) people called Hindus were reckoned by fifth century astronomers to have existed as early as 3101 B.C. which agrees, of course, with my theory that they were wandering descendants of Adam's sons. This idea is strengthened by Dr. Perry's information that Hindus fought against the Asuras or "Nagas" who carried the serpent banner, for all their innate feelings must have recoiled from the Babylonian practices. As said, before, the Aryans too had at first fought against the Nagas chiefs although, like the Hindus, they finally joined up with them and became what are generally now called "Dravidians."

The word "Dravidian" brings up another question. Dr. Perry writes: "The Aryans came to India to find a flourishing Dravidian civilisation." This being so, one asks why did not the Dravidians at once repel the antagonistic Aryans? Why did they not do the same to the Hindus who also fought against them? From these facts we have concluded that neither of the invaders were Cainites or Serpent worshippers.

The only answer to these questions is, so far as I can see, that for countless centuries before the arrival of Aryans and Hindus, Cain's descendants living in the Indus Valley had married pre-adamite wives, in default of women of the white race and that in consequence the race had deteriorated: "A strange punishment," to quote from Job xiii, "had fallen upon the doers of iniquity."

Dr. Perry helps my theories, though unintentionally, by writing about the inhabitants of Hawaii:—

"It is said that formerly some of the chiefs claimed descent from the great god Kain, evidently a sun-god, in which case their birth must have been by a process of theogamy" (*Children of the Sun*, p. 165).

From this, I gather, that the story of Cain had reached the Hawaii Islands and Dr. Perry helps me further by writing of the Indian rulers:—

"It is found that all the Rajput clans claim descent from a common ancestor ... every family showing their pedigree leading back to some branch, however insignificant, which sprang out of the original root and stem of the tribe. This is the real aristocracy of India, with which every Hindu dynasty or family of influence or new wealth (except Brahmans) tries to find some connection ..." (*ibid.*).

From the above paragraph two big questions emerge which I must, at least, try to answer. First, who were the Rajput clans? Secondly, who was their common ancestor? From between the lines, as it were, of Dr. Perry's pages I learn that the Rajputs are the descendants of leading Aryans, Hindus and Asuras (or Nagas). We have seen how after fighting it out, so to speak, in the Indus Valley they merged into one people and are now best known as Dravidians. As in Iraq, centuries earlier, Adam's descendants through Noah had descended upon Cain's race, so in India, the two branches of Adam's family met, fought and made peace, after which the Serpent worshippers practically swayed them all. As regards the "common ancestor," who can doubt that he was Cain?

Chapter Six

"Facts are stubborn things."—Tobias George Smollet.

Before presenting the evidence of Mythology—my trump card, as it were, in identifying Sargon of Akkad with Cain—I wish to draw attention to the new light thrown upon several astonishing discoveries in Iraq by connecting them with Cain. The first of these discoveries is recorded in (*Buried Empires*, pp. 24-25), the author explaining how, in 1854, British excavators on the site of Uruk (Enoch or Uruk) came across:—

"The well-preserved remains of a wall superbly decorated with a mosaic of terra-cotta pencils, their heads coloured red, white and black, which were driven into the plaster, one beside the other, so as to cover the whole wall-surface with a rich pattern of triangles and zig-zags."

Continuing, he says:—

"The unique nature of the discovery was scarcely appreciated at the time; the wall was left to become sanded over again and completely lost to sight."

Here again I picture truth making a bid for freedom and being thwarted. It was not until 1930-31 that German excavators re-discovered the building to which the wall belonged, and (on page 51) Mr. Carleton tells how he himself saw it after the final excavation. He speaks of the "great columns of the entrance hall," calling them the oldest in the world, and of its "red, white and black-banded walls" which, he says, were "only more delightful than unexpected." He adds that the effect under "the flaming sunlight of an Iraqi Spring was of the complicated pattern on the skin of some rare snake." "What," he writes, "the great temple, if such it was, must have been in its days of pride we can imagine" (*Buried Empires*, p.53).

To the British excavators, in 1854, the section of wall they uncovered must have looked like the broken wing of some colossal butterfly against the sandy soil of the treeless, stoneless desert, which Iraq is now known to have been in the beginning of history. One thing certain is, that without an army of slaves under skilled overseers, the extraordinarily elaborate work could not have been carried out.

Cuneiform texts fortunately show that Sargon fought against men of his own race, taking captives of war whom he placed in his cities in Iraq, the whole northern part of which is now sometimes called Akkad, or Agade, we read:—

"Sargon is also stated to have made successful expeditions to Syria and Elam, and with the conquered peoples of those countries he peopled Akkad and built there a magnificent palace and temple" (*Worship of the Dead*, Garnier, p. 398).

Sargon's skilled overseers may therefore have all been Adamites, and an ancestor of Abraham may have been among his captives of war, which would explain why the patriarch was born in Ur. Mr. Carleton's words: "the great temple—if such it was," imply, of course, that there was nothing to prove the Mosaic building to be a temple and since the German excavators had shortly before, in excavating Erech, dug down to two older buildings which they identified as temples to "Anu" and the Mother-goddess, I feel justified in suggesting that the Mosaic masterpiece was Cain's banqueting hall, a luxury he surely must have had, for as Professor L. King writes:—

"In some versions of his records Sargon states that 5,400 men daily eat bread before him" (*Legends of Babylon and Egypt*, p. 9). Mr. Carleton gives the measurements of the building as about 180 feet wide and 240 feet long, large enough, I am informed, to hold the number of men Sargon mentions: presumably they were the men called in his records: "the sons of his palace," or "delegates of his authority." (*Cambridge History*, Vol. I, p. 416).

We read:

"Sargon divided his vast empire from the lower sea to the upper sea, from the rising to the setting of the sun, into districts of five double-hours march each, over which he placed the 'sons of his palace'" (*ibid.*).

All Assyriologists must have heard of the amazing mosaic building, though in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (eleventh edition published in 1910-11) the "earliest specimens of mosaic existing are said to have been found in Nineveh and Egypt, and to be all on small articles.

What has become of the building I do not know, but the part of it, first found, may well have influenced Professor Sayce when, in 1887, he propounded the theory that Erech was the city built by Cain; also Dr. Waddell, some fifty years later, when he published the same belief.

How indeed, one wonders, could those great scholars avoid connecting the extraordinary work of art with Erech, whose ancient names—"the old city" and "the place of the settlement" are both so appropriate for the city built by Cain, or with the legends still lingering from time immemorial near the sites of Sargon's cities, telling of a miraculous tree and of mystical beings rising out of the Persian Gulf, bringing with them, the arts of irrigation, agriculture and architecture?

It seems, however, that few people have been told about the miraculous mosaic building. It has been said "What Science cannot explain it derides"—in this case we might add "or ignores."

The second discovery which I feel deserves attention, at this point, is the life-size bronze head of a man, photographs of which are reproduced on the first page of this book; for everything points to its being the portrait of Cain at the height of his career. To me the work is quite probably that of his great-great-grandson Tubal Cain, the "instructor of every artificer in brass and iron" (Genesis iv).

My belief that the head represents Cain is, of course, supported by the fact that one of our most distinguished archaeologists announces (rather diffidently) his instinctive conviction that it is the portrait of Sargon of Akkad. He writes:—

"It is no exaggeration to claim the head among the great masterpieces of antiquity. Who is it that the head represents ... we can only guess, but I am rash enough to suggest that we may have before us a portrait of Sargon of Akkad himself, a monarch who boasted of conquests extending from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf" (Professor Mallowan in a book published by the British School of Archæology in Iraq. Vol. III, 1926).

Why Professor Mallowan hesitates, in the above passage, to claim the unique work as a portrait of Sargon of Akkad, is, I venture to suggest, because he, like Sir Leonard Woolley and others, accepts the theory that Sargon reigned in the third millenium B.C., but as we have seen a falling off in art took place after the fourth millenium and it seems impossible that such a masterpiece of art should have been accomplished in a period of deterioration. Perhaps the Professor finds unconvincing the theory of a renaissance of art in the third millenium, invented presumably to explain fine works unquestionably executed in Sargon's reign. However that may be he writes enthusiastically about the head, ending his eloquent article upon it in the Museum Book with Shakespeare's words:—

"A combination and a form indeed where every god did set his seal, to give the world assurance of a man."

If, as I believe, the head represents the first-born of mankind, the quotation seems most apt. Indirectly, the Professor happens to support my views by saying:—

"Up to date there is neither in stone nor in metal, any head which bears a close resemblance to this one, but there are some parallels for the hair-dressing which are very close indeed, and some evidence from stone sculpture which can help us to determine at what period the head was made."

The most striking parallel is, in my opinion, the resemblance between the arrangement of hair on the metal head excavated at Nineveh in the ruins of Istar's temple, and the carved hair on the golden helmet excavated by Sir Leonard Woolley in the cemetery founded, according to him, in about 3500 B.C., when Cain could have been alive. Considering that the same authority writes about graves of Sargon's daughter's servants, also found by him in the cemetery, which he says was closed down by about 3200 B.C., I feel justified in concluding that the helmet belonged to Cain, and in a later chapter more will be said in support of that view.

Another parallel exists between the metal head and that on a stone bas-relief, believed to be a posthumous portrait of Sargon, which is said in the *Cambridge History* to wear a beard, and hair rolled into a "huge chignon" at the back of the head. Both beard and chignon are conspicuous features of the metal head and seem to have been copied by the ruling class in Mohenjo-Daro, a city Mr. Carleton considers contemporary with the Ur

Cemetery. The chignon has been found, too, in little carved pictures dug up in the ruins of Sargon's city of Erech, and carved upon lumps of clay believed to have been stoppers for jars. Mr. Carleton describes the carvings as both handsome and interesting and surprising in their realism. "A commonly represented scene," he writes "is that of a bearded man with his hair rolled in a great bunch on his neck and enclosed by a fillet, wearing a long robe and a sash, and carrying a tall lance in his hand. Before him crouch several captives, their necks and knees fastened together and their arms tied behind them" (*Buried Empires*).

My belief is that the carvings represent Cain as High Priest about to spear the wretched captives destined for the cannibalistic orgies of the priests. The idea is encouraged by Professor Sayce's remarks:—

"Human flesh was consumed in Babylonia in the earliest times in honour of the gods ... human sacrifices were part of their religion" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 83, 1887).

Pictures of the same kind have been excavated in Egypt which Dr. Waddell claims as part of Sargon's empire: Mr. Carleton writes about them:—

"It is a most significant fact that on certain finely-carved palettes of slate which have been found in Egypt and which belong to the period just before the First Egyptian Dynasty, rather similar scenes of execution or sacrifice in the presence of a king are pictured." (*ibid.*, p. 55). Mr. Carleton mentions that:—

"A famous carved dagger-hilt from Gebel-el-Araq, in Egypt, shows a god robed and bearded precisely in the fashion of the spear-bearer in the Uruk seals" (*ibid.*, p.55).

That Sargon introduced civilization into Egypt is practically proved by the fact recorded in the *Enclopædia Britannica* (11th ed. p. 956, "Cairo"):

"The most ancient known settlement in the immediate neighbourhood of the city was the town of Babylon."

It seems that the Egyptian "Babylon" was said by Strabo to have been founded by immigrants from the city of that name in 525 B.C., at the time of the Persian conquest of Egypt. Since, however, Strabo was not born before 63 B.C., he may easily have been wrong about the date of the Egyptian city still known as "Babylon." When he wrote, even the Persian conquest of Egypt in 525 B.C., must have become a vague memory. How much more so must have been the coming of Cain to the banks of the Nile if it took place in the fourth millennium B.C. as there is good reason to believe it did?

Concluding that Cain founded the Egyptian civilization the lights go up, so to speak, upon certain dark spots in Egyptian history. We can picture how the Babylonian priesthood (which became rich and powerful owing to Joseph's policy during the years of famine) established in Egypt the worship of "Ammon," the deified form of Ham^[24] who some scholars believe married Cain's descendant Naamah.^[25] We see how human sacrifices and ritual cannibalism were taught in Egypt from the beginning of its history and can understand why, after the miracles performed by Moses, the Pharaohs (descended from Noah), discarded the Babylonian religion into which they had lapsed, although they were powerless to abolish the priests, their army having perished in the Red Sea. This explains why the priests conspired against the Pharaohs, called them "heretics" in their cuneiform texts, and finally murdered the last Pharaoh, whom they called "that criminal of an Akhnaton," together with his family and courtiers, and themselves became rulers of the country.

In the *Chaldean Genesis*, George Smith gives a photograph of a Babylonian seal upon which is the figure of a man wearing a bunch of hair on his neck and clasping the claw of a fearsome beast. George Smith describes the picture as "Bel encountering the Dragon," but to me the comic figures represent Cain's compact with the Devil. Professor Sayce writes, after explaining that the inauguration ceremony of the Babylonian kings was known as "taking the hand of Bel":—

"The claimant to the sovereignty took the hand of Bel, as it was called, and then became the adopted son of the god. Until this ceremony, however, much as he might be a king *de facto* he was not so *de jure* ... the legal title could be given by Bel and by Bel only" (*Babylonian and Assyrian Life*, p. 36).

A grim jest surely—this "taking the hand of Bel," and quite inexplicable, unless Sargon of Akkad was Cain who was "of the evil one." (1 John, iii. 12).

Chapter Seven

"Our doubts are traitors—and make us lose the good we oft might win."—Shakespeare.

Of all that excavations have taught us, the most potentially valuable discovery is that the knowledge of God reached Babylonia in the beginning of history. Only the anti-Christian teaching from abroad can explain the seeming indifference with which that discovery has been treated in this Christian land.

If, as I hold, the Babylonian priests instituted by Cain, were the determined apostates described in the first letter of St. Paul to the Romans, it seems indeed a miracle that any evidence of the primeval knowledge of God has come down to us; for, in the library of the Assyrian kings who ruled for a time in Iraq, in which priest-scribes had entire charge, they could destroy, alter or add to any document brought there from what had once been Sargon's kingdom. Fortunately, they contented themselves with only giving the following illuminating prayer a misleading dedication to the Moon-god Sin or Nannar, Up-Lifter of Horns.

In quoting the prayer, Professor Sayce mildly remarks: "The old bilingual hymn to the Moon-god Nannar of Ur is more suitable for a supreme Baal than for a local moon-god." His translation runs:—

"Father long suffering and full of forgiveness, whose hand upholds the life of all mankind, Lord, thy divinity, like the far off heaven, fills the wide sea with fear Firstborn, omnipotent, whose heart is immensity and there is none to discern it Lord the ordainer of the laws of heaven and earth, whose command may not be (broken) In heaven who is supreme? As for thee, thy will is made known on earth, and the spirits below kiss the ground. As for thee, thy will is blown on high like the wind; the stall and the fold are quickened. As for thee, thy will is done on the earth, and the herb grows green" (*Gifford Lectures*, p. 320).

Now that Assyriologists teach that Ur was the birth place of Abraham, and that, before his time, Sargon had made raids upon the Shemites in Syria, bringing back prisoners and settling them in his cities, one feels justified in suggesting that this monotheistic hymn was brought into Babylonia by an ancestor of Abraham and that a copy of it was taken up to Nineveh in the time of Assur-bani-pal. (7th Century B.C.) Modern churchmen who have ascribed the teaching of "the fundamental beliefs about God and man on which the Christian religion reposes" to the period of the later prophets, cannot have known of the Babylonian evidence referred to by Professor Sayce in the following paragraph.

"The conception of a divine Messenger or angel who carried the orders of the highest god from heaven to earth and interpreted his will to men, goes back to an early period in the history of Babylonian Religion" (page 361).

In St. Jude's Epistle, we read of angels "who kept not their first estate but left their own habitation and are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgement of the great day." An obvious travesty of this celestial event was dug up on a brick tablet in Iraq and offering its translation and explaining that in the first lines (which are missing) some festival held in heaven was probably described, Professor Sayce writes:—

"The divine being spoke three times the commencement of a psalm. The god of holy songs, Lord of religion and worship seated a thousand singers and musicians: and established a choral band. Who to his hymn were to respond in multitudes

With a loud cry of contempt they broke up his hymn of praise.
The god of a bright crown with a wish to summon his adherents sounded a trumpet blast which would wake the dead.
Which to those rebel angels prohibited return, he stopped their service, and sent them to the gods who were his enemies.
In their room he created mankind.
The first who received life, dwelt along with him.
May he give them strength, never to neglect his word, following the serpent's voice, whom his hands had made."

Sayce remarks that the mediæval church also held the opinion that mankind was created to fill up the void in creation caused by the rebellion of the ungrateful angels. This reminds one that, in Genesis, Adam is commanded to "replenish the earth and subdue it." One wonders what more the priestly scribe could have told had he chosen. That he knew all that we learn from the first chapters of the Bible, can scarcely be doubted. These obvious travesties by ribald priests support my claim that Cain took down to the "Land of Nod," much that his parents had taught him as a child.

Professor Sayce (in *Schweich Lectures*, published in 1908), gives translations of what he calls "Penitential Hymns," one of which might be thought to echo Cain's agony of mind before he hardened his heart and, in defiance of the first commandment, "Thou shalt have none other gods than me," invented the four gods established in Erech. In the reiterated words, "who knew though I knew not," may be sensed a growing resentment and spirit of revolt. The hymn begins:—

"The transgression I have committed I knew not. The sin I sinned I knew not. The forbidden thing did I trample on. My Lord in the wrath of his heart hath overpowered me, God who knew (though I knew not) hath pierced me ... I lay on the ground and no man seized me by the hand. I wept and my palms none took. I cried aloud and there was none that could hear me. I am in darkness and trouble. I lifted not myself up. To my God I referred (my distress) My prayer I addressed How long, O my God shall I suffer? How long, O my God, who knewest (though) I knew not, shall thy heart be wrath?" (*Schweich Lectures*, p. 23, published 1908).

In 1885, Sayce had published another "Penitential Hymn," which, he remarks, was used as part of a temple ritual. This hymn, I believe, was composed later than the one above, and its great importance, to my mind, is that it records Cain's first step in idolatry, for the goddess Ishtar (whose name was presumably derived from that first given by Adam to his wife Ishshar (woman) which he changed to "Eve" (meaning Life) is invoked by the "Penitent" in the very same words as he addresses to the Creator. We read:

"May God be appeased again, for I knew not that I sinned. May Ishtar, my mother be appeased again, for I knew not that I sinned, God knoweth that I knew not; may he be appeased. Ishtar, my mother,^[26] knoweth that I knew not; may she be appeased.
May the heart of my God be appeased.
May God and Ishtar my mother, be appeased God, in the strength of his heart, has taken me, Ishtar, my mother, has seized me, and put me to grief;"

Apparently seeing no significance in these hymns, Sayce writes of the second: "A rubric is attached to this verse, stating that it is to be repeated ten times." (*Assyria, its Princes, Priests and People*, p. 73). Thus, presumably Cain's apostasy was commemorated by the priests of Baal in their temple ritual, but, of course, nothing of the kind could occur to Professor Sayce after he adopted the German scholars' theory that the Genesis characters were merely copies of Babylonian gods and goddesses. Istar,^[27] when identified with our first mother, is a veritable beacon in the literary maze of Babylonian Mythology. Eve's sorrow for the death of Abel undoubtedly inspired what Sayce describes as "the Legend of Istar's descent into Hell to seek Tammuz" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 212), which he tells us, was the origin of the later legends of Isis and Osiris, of Demeter and Persephone, of

Euridice and Orpheus. According to him, Istar became the "Ashtoreth of the Canaanites, the Astarte of the Phœnicians, and in Greece, Diana or Artemis, Venus or Aphrodite" (*ibid.*). There is reason to believe, also, that Eve was the model from which was drawn the "Queen of Heaven" to whom the recreant Jews burnt incense in the time of Jeremiah (xliv. 15-18).

In Babylonia, Istar was given many names, one of which was Nina or Nintu, who was said to have divined all the mysteries of the gods; (*Sumer and Akkad*, p. 266), an unmistakeable reference to Eve's acquisition of God-like knowledge which cost mankind its immortality. It is important, too, to notice that Professor Sayce complains of the puzzling "kaleidoscopic interchange of gods and goddesses in Babylonian mythology." He writes of "the doubt as to whether Istar were male or female" and mentions an astronomical tablet in which Istar is a female at sunset and a male at sunrise" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 254).

These changes of sex, together with other discrepancies and contradictions indulged in by the Babylonian scribes, account for the late Dr. Pinches' announcement that in ancient pagan writings "There is hardly any doubt that a desire existed to make things as difficult as possible" (*Ancient Egypt*, Part 3, 1923. Edited by Flinders Petrie).

That the scribes (all priests of Baal be it remembered) were obscuring great truths they could not resist writing about, evidently did not strike Professor Sayce when he wrote "Istar was also Yasnu the wise one," the "Lady of the Deep," and the "Mistress of the Abode of the Fish," and that therefore she must have ranked with Ea the Fish-god, the "Lord of the Deep" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 76). This happens to be a useful admission, for, by identifying the Fish or Snake god Ea, with Istar we find, as will be shown later, Cain in mythology. In little clay images, found lately in graves in Southern Iraq, the great mother is represented as a woman carrying a child and having a head like that of a snake. Commenting upon this, Mr. Carleton writes:

"Probably we have here a very early witness to one of the most venerable and far-spreading religious traditions in the world ... the worship of the Mother goddess ... under a thousand names ... her strange reptilian head puts us in mind of the innumerable myths in which a goddess is identified with a snake or dragon."

He adds that the early Babylonians worshipped Amaushumgal, "Mother-Dragon of Heaven," and that "a snake was supposed to have stolen the secret of renewed life from men" (*Buried Empires*, p. 40). He concludes by saying:—

"The monthly miracle by which a snake rubs off his old discoloured skin and becomes fresh and bright again must have made a great impression on primitive man."

To my mind, the story of Eve and the Serpent was more likely to impress the Babylonians than the habits of a snake (p. 118). As Ishtar, Eve's compassion and remorse are clearly indicated in the following lines, presumably composed after the time of Noah, as a destructive "storm" is mentioned. The lines run:

"Istar cried aloud like a woman in travail, the Lady of the gods lamented with a loud voice saying, The old race of man hath been turned back into clay, because I assented to an evil thing in the council of the gods, and agreed to a storm which hath destroyed my people, that which I brought forth." (*Babylonian Religion*, Leonard King, p. 134).

One hopes that it was after the deaths of Cain and his successor, Nar-am-Sim, that "in Erech," as Professor Sayce writes:—

"Unspeakable abominations were practised in the name of Ishtar which were outdone in horror in other Babylonian cities. The black Ishtar, as we may call her, was the parody of the goddess of love and the rites with which she was adored and the ministers by whom she was served were equally parodies of the cult

which was carried on at Erech ..." (*Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylon*, pp. 342-343). In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th ed. under "Devil") we read:

"The old Serpent goddess ... 'the lady Nina' was transformed into the embodiment of all that was hostile to the powers of heaven, and confounded with the dragon Tiamat ... the principle of chaos, the enemy of God and man."

Through Professor Sayce's identification of Ea with Istar, we get a very different glimpse of our first mother's character. He says: "Ea is said to be merciful, compassionate, wise, sentient and pure" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 140), also that Ea was "the god of all rivers and the supposed ocean stream, the source of Babylonian civilisation" also "the god of Eridu once on the shores of the Persian Gulf." Why Ea was called the father of Merodach (Bel's only rival in the last Babylonian pantheon) the Professor says he cannot make out but, inadvertently, he helps to solve the problem by giving another reason for identifying Ea with Ishtar, whom, as before noticed, he shows to have been Anu's partner in Erech. Writing about what he describes as a great work in 72 books which formed part of Sargon's library, he says that "up to the time of Berossus" (3rd century B.C.,) the work was ascribed to the god Bel himself and sometimes quoted as "Observations" or "Illuminations" of Bel. Very significantly he adds:—

"In the 'Observations of Bel' we may trace the origin of human sacrifice, against which practice the Israelites were warned after they left Egypt, where it was carried on by the pagan priests." (Lev. xviii, 21.)

Further he says:

"In the Observations of Bel' the stars^[28] are already invested with a divine character. The planets are gods like the sun and moon, and that stars have already been identified with certain deities of the official pantheon The whole heaven, as well as the periods of the moon, has been divided between the three supreme divinities, Anu, Bel and Ea, (p. 400).

So, here, we find Ea sharing Anu's throne in heaven instead of Istar (as in the text before quoted, "Istar with Anu the king into a noble seat they raised and in the government of heaven they fixed"), and may conclude that they were one and the same; that both represented Adam's wife, and that the great god Merodach or Marduk of later history whose name is thought to be derived from "marad"—to rebel—and who is constantly called "son of Ea," was Cain.

As before noted, Professor Sayce regards "the god Tammuz" as the "prototype" of Abel; he therefore throws light upon the subject by showing that one of Merodach's names was Adar (another was Ares who became Mars) and writing:—

"Another title connects Adar with the Ares of Greek mythology, who, in the form of the wild boar, slew the Sun-god Tammuz" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 123).

The French Professor Delaporte explains that, in Babylon, in the reign of Hammurabi (circa 2000 B.C.,) Merodach was said to have vanquished the monster Tiamat (Chaos) and that the older gods, as a reward, bestowed upon him their attributes. He writes: "The gods of Babylon assembled to pay homage to Merodach and, while the Sky-god Anu abandoned his powers to him Ea, his father, granted him his own name saying: 'Let him be called after me'."

Quoting again from the Babylonian "Story of the Creation," the Professor writes:—

"Moreover he, Merodach, possessed all his, Ea's wisdom, 'My child' Ea had said to him, 'What is there that thou knowest not and what could I teach thee? What I know thou knowest also.'" (*Mesopotamia*. Delaporte. Professor in the Catholic Institute of Paris, 1925).

Thus, thanks to the Babylonian's obsession with the story of their great founder, the truth escapes at times from the dreary prison known as Mythology. What could the above words mean but that Eve taught her son Cain all her stolen knowledge and that the Babylonian priests who composed the cuneiform texts were well aware of the fact?

In a conspiracy of secrecy carried on for countless centuries leakages naturally occurred. For example the following text betrays the fact that Anu (Adam) was Merodach's father, and allows us boldly to proclaim the fish or snake god Ea as the mythological disguise of Eve:

"Marduk is king they bestowed upon him sceptre, throne and palace by his side he slung the net, the gift of his father Anu" (*Story of Creation and Origins of Bible Traditions*, T. Clay, p. 203).

An equally useful text runs: "Anu had placed a club and bow in the hand of Merodach" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 102). May not this refer to Adam's parting gift to Cain?

Under the name of Asari, another title of Merodach (or Marduk,) I find Cain described as "nourisher of the black race," which reminds us of the "Good Eden Land" of the Indus Valley, and in another text, Merodach is described as:—

"The donor of fruitfulness, the founder of agriculture, the creator of grain and plants, who causes the green herb to spring forth." (Clay, *Origin of Biblical Traditions*, p. 211).

With no thought of Cain and his mother, Professor Sayce refers to traditions still cherished on the shores of the Persian Gulf to which I hope to show Cain wandered. He writes:—

"It was from the Persian Gulf that tradition conceived the culture and civilisation of Babylonia to have come, and Ea was therefore lord of wisdom as well as lord of the deep. His son Merodach was the minister of his councils, by whom the commands of wisdom were carried into practice. Merodach was thus the active side of his father Ea" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 104).

The relationship between Sargon and Tammuz leaks out in Babylonian mythology. In one text we read: "Tammuz the son of the River-god Ea." In another we find the words "Sargon, the mighty man, son of the god Ea." Colonel Conder gives the following words, purporting to be Sargon's, found upon a vase of calcite stalagmite: "King Sargina, king of Erech, the world-king, the prince of God, the mighty man, the obedient son of the god Ea ... listening obediently to the god Enlil ... invoking Nina, the far-famed lady of Erech." Who, but Cain, could have called himself the prince of God, while boasting of his allegiance to the Devil? "Nina" was merely one of Ishtar's countless names as Professor Sayce detected and wrote: "It is pretty clear that Nina, the lady, must have been the primitive Istar." Professor Leonard King writes: "Nina who could divine all the mysteries of the gods" and my conclusion is that Nina represented Eve. Professor King identifies Nina with Innini, and Innini with Istar, who, he says, was "the Semitic goddess of Agade" (*Sumer and Akkad*, p. 404).

In playful mood, apparently, the Babylonian scribes represented Merodach and Adar as a kind of "Jekyll and Hyde."

Explaining the effusion, Sayce writes:—

"Adar bears the same relation to Mul-lil that Merodach bears to Ea. Each, alike, is the son and messenger of his elder god. But the errands upon which Merodach is sent, are errands of mercy and benevolence, while the errands of Adar are those which befit an implacable warrior. He contends not against the powers of darkness, like Merodach, for the father whose order he obeys is himself the ruler of the powers of darkness. It is against mankind, as in the story of the Deluge, that his arms are directed. He is the solar hero who belongs to the darkness and not to the light" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 154).

The good character given to Merodach in the above, is belied by the ominous names given to four hounds, said to be Merodach's constant companions. The first is named "Uccumu" meaning "the despoiler," the second, "Acculu" meaning "the devourer", the third, "the capturer," and the fourth, "Iltebu," the "carrier away" (*The Chaldean Genesis*, p. 190).

The last two names are peculiarly suited to "King Cain," who, as before mentioned, claims in inscriptions to have made war upon people of his own race and carried away captives to populate his new cities.

Probably Cain's invention of a false religion inspired some satirist to inscribe the next words:

"To (Merodach) the prince of the gods, the interpreter (barbar) of the spirits of heaven and (earth) (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 128).

Other examples of this kind could be given but I hope enough has been said to satisfy the reader that the founder of the Babylonian empire was Cain and that he was flimsily disguised in mythology as Merodach, or Marduk the Sun-god who, together with Bel, was worshipped in Babylon up to the end of that city. Sayce quotes two long prayers of Nebuchadnezzar in which that king addresses Merodach as "the first-born, the glorious, the first-born of the gods, Merodach the prince." Who but Cain could have inspired such titles? To whom else would the same king of Babylon have said "I love the height of thy court; among all mankind have I not seen a city of the earth fairer than thy city of Babylon" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 97). As previously shown, there is reason to regard Cain as the builder of Babylon.

One suspects that Nebuchadnezzar (as hereditary high-priest) knew well whom Merodach represented. Cain's whole story must have been known in the Middle East. It had certainly reached Palestine in the first century A.D. for his murder of Abel is mentioned by two of the Apostles, and also by the ancient Jewish historians, Josephus and Philo. The masses of the people may have known nothing about their ancient history, but the priests who, in pagan lands, were always the custodians of Cain's artificial religion, cannot have been ignorant of the fact that the founder of their order was the first-born of mankind.

Modern scholars have been strangely averse to the theory of the Greek mythographer Euhemerus, of the fourth century B.C., that all the gods were modelled upon human beings. Yet, as early as the 4th century A.D. the Christian Bishop Augustine of Africa, wrote in his book *De civita Dei*:

"Alexander the great told his mother in a letter that even the higher gods were men ... and the secret was told him by Leo the high-priest of Egyptian sacred things Alexander requested his mother to burn the letter in which he said this." (Quoted from *The Worship of the Dead*, p. 15, Garnier).

It will be agreed, I think, that had the admission of the Egyptian high-priest become widely known fewer learned enquiries into pagan mythology would have been published, and a human being capable of inventing it might have been sought for in history. St. Paul encourages the inference that the system of mythology began in the beginning so we are justified in believing Cain to be its inventor for he was "of the wicked one."

Chapter Eight

"Truth at bottom of a well."

In a chapter headed "The Great Mother and Human Sacrifice," the author of *Children of the Sun*, writing while Egyptian culture was still awarded the priority of antiquity, mentions as a curious fact that:

"The chief and dominant note in the Pyramid texts is an insistent, even passionate, protest against death."

Dr. Perry offers no reason for this, but now that Egypt can be regarded as a colony of Babylonia, and the scribes who carved the Pyramid texts as Babylonians, it seems natural to connect the "passionate protest" with Cain's

anger against his parents for their loss of immortality. One feels that Byron was really inspired when he depicted that anger in "Cain a Mystery."

A "passionate protest" may also be detected in the "Penitential Hymn," before quoted, in which the Penitent calls his mother "Isthar"—thereby proving her identify with Eve—saying "she put him to grief." He makes no complaint against Anu, who represents Adam and who is said to have given "Merodach" (Cain's representative) certain objects which I assume were parting gifts. This suggests that Adam was more ready to forgive Cain's murder of Abel than was his wife.

Judging from Isthar's lament (already quoted) Eve blamed herself alone for the advent of death into the world and posterity seems to have judged her the more guilty for, while ugly clay figures of a woman (identified by experts as the Mother Goddess) and presumably an insult to Eve's memory have been dug up on prehistoric sites, "male figures" according to Dr. Perry, were non-existent; Adam, it seems, was spared Posterity's abuse. When, therefore, I read Dr. Perry's question—why did those people make such grotesque figures of women? I answer to myself—because of the tragic result of Eve's curiosity; as the bringer of death she was abominated.

Even in Christendom up to the end of the 17th century, as Sir James Frazer shows, the peasants ignorantly burlesqued the "Passionate protest" against death by enacting a yearly ceremony in which, after being carried about in a procession, the straw effigy of an old woman was either burnt or sawn in two. Surely, unknown to the revellers, the old woman represented our first mother Eve. (*Golden Bough*, "Old Woman-sawn-in-two").

Professor Elliot Smith offers other views. He suggests that the hideous figures of women dug up at Anau, Erech and elsewhere represent "the first deity, the Mother Goddess," and according to Dr. Perry "postulates the gradual development in prehistoric times of the conception of a creator, the giver of life, health, and good luck," adding, "this great mother, first with only vaguely defined traits, was probably the first deity that the will of man devised to console him with her watchful care over his welfare in this life, and to give him assurances as to his future." (*Children of the Sun*, p. 216).

It might seem as if some scribe, or scribes, had recognized the great mother under her disguise of the snake-god Ea, for Professor Sayce writes, quoting Babylonian texts: "Ea is said to be merciful, compassionate, wise, sentient and pure Also "the author of knowledge and intelligence" (*Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 40-41, 118). So Eve, it seems, had some champions in Babylonia.

Puzzling over the conflicting impressions of the great goddess met with in eastern mythology, Dr. Perry writes:

"It is strange that the great author of all things, the source of life, should be also destructive, yet such is the case Her cults are dual, divided into black and white, benevolent and cruel" (*Children of the Sun*, p. 225).

He mentions some of the titles given to the Great Mother, which include: Uma, the gracious, Parvati, the daughter of the mountains, Durga, the inaccessible, Gauri, the bright one, Sati, the devoted wife, Bhairavi, the terror-inspiring, Kali, the black one, Karela, the horrible one: and, mentioning two other names, he writes:

"Neither is there room for doubt that the blood of human victims flowed on the altars of these gloomy goddesses, before the horrible images of Kali, Candika, and Camundo" (*ibid.*).

Clearly, however, others of the great Mother's titles indicate that it was taught by the pioneers of culture (hereditary priests no doubt) that from her, through Cain, came the knowledge needed to make men wealthy and to afford them luxuries. The titles include those of Corn-Mother, Maize-Mother, Rice-Mother, Gold-Mother, and Pearl-Mother. Incidentally the last two show that such activities as mining for metals and diving for pearls were carried on in the beginning of history. Dr. Perry observes that the Polynesians (still noted as daring pearl fishers) came from the Persian Gulf, and since Cain's city of Enoch (Erech) was built upon the northern border of the Gulf, this remark inadvertently supports my theories.

Thus, I submit, light has been thrown upon the knowledge acquired by our first mother from the forbidden fruit and more light of the kind can be found in Dr. Perry's other works—when the Bible key is used.

It seems clear that the "Karna" of an Indian legend, quoted by Dr. Perry, was modelled upon Cain. The hero is described as "born encased in natural armour and with face brightened with ear-rings." He is said to be the first of all wielders of weapons, and to be endowed with the beauty of a celestial child. It is said of him:

"that destroyer of hostile hosts ... the large eyed Karna was born of Pritha. He was a portion of the hot-beamed sun He was capable of slaying a lion" (*Children of the Sun*, p. 166).

In carvings dug up in southern Iraq a single man is shown slaying a lion, or sometimes two. Presumably he represents Cain—the Indian "Karna." Perhaps those "large eyes of "Karna" can explain the wilful destruction of the eyes in the superb metal head found in the ruins of Nineveh where Cain's memory may well have been hated by the Assyrians, who were Semites and ruled for a time in that city.

In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th ed.), we read under "Australia" (a country well known to have had a short period of culture in prehistoric times,) that the Bushmen, probably partly pre-Adamites, worship publicly the Mantis-insect, which they call Kane or Ikkagen, while they privately venerate an all-father of truly divine nature.

The last words set one thinking: was it through the unwonted candour of some "Babylonian priest" that the knowledge of such a Being reached the Bushmen, or was it in later times, through some Christian Missionary?

The fact that Professor Sayce writes in his *Hibbert Lectures*, the knowledge of the soul existed in Babylonia in Sargon's time, prepares one for Dr. Perry's information that in India the soul substance is a prominent feature of their belief. He writes:—

"The Priesthood are connected with the sky-beings."

This remark reminds a Bible reader of Genesis ii, 7:—

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

In some miraculous way the writer of Genesis must have become aware of this and the forbidden fruit must have taught it to Eve, and Eve to Cain. It may well, therefore, have been through one of Cain's followers that the idea of a breath of life came into India, where it still lingers in traditions and superstitions.

In Dr. Perry's *Megalithic Culture in Indonesia*, we read:—

"It is said that sky-beings went up to the sky to get the breath of life. And the importance the chiefs attach to the soul-substance is shown by the fact that when an eminent chief of Nian is about to die his son who succeeds him, has to inhale his last breath," (page 152).

The "soul-substance" is said to assume various shapes when it leaves the body.

"Sometimes," Perry writes, "it returns to the patient in the form of a butterfly. Professor Kruuijt once showed a worm he found in a water butt to some Toradja folk, and they expressed great alarm, for it was to them, someone's soul-substance" (*Megalithic Culture in Indonesia*, p. 50).

The same author writes:—

"The Toradja are indefinite about the fate of the soul-substance after death. 'It goes back to the lord up above,' says one. 'It becomes a bird,' says another; but generally no answer can be given."

It is taught by the priests that the soul-substance can assume the form of certain animals, including snakes. Dr. Perry writes:—

"If a snake crosses a path in front of someone it must be killed at once, for it may be the soul-substance of an enemy," (*ibid.*, p. 150).

Inevitably one is reminded by all this of the serpent tempter in the Garden of Eden. May it not have contained the soul-substance of Lucifer, the fallen angel, who said in his heart:—

"I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation; I will be like the Most High." "Yet," the Prophet thunders to Lucifer: "Thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit" (Isaiah, xiv, 15).

Presumably Lord Byron knew nothing about the Indian superstitions when he made Cain ask Lucifer if he had been the tempter, and Lucifer denied it. The truth was not likely to come, however, from the servant of the "father of all lies," as perhaps the poet realised.

Hoping to have made convincing my identification of the Babylonian Sargon with the Biblical Cain, I shall try, next, to trace Cain's wanderings south from his parents' second home to the district called in the Bible the Land of Nod. First, however, it seems well to glance at the kind of culture he taught there, and at the ways in which it reached the eastern hemisphere in the beginning of history.

For the learned works which have enabled me to write upon the subject I wish here to express my sincere gratitude.

Chapter Nine

"And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also unto her husband.

"And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil and now lest, he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken."—Genesis iii.

The reader who ignores the stories of the Garden of Eden and Cain's crime and punishment will have to close Dr. Perry's most informative book of five hundred pages, asking the very same question the author puts to himself, namely "What of the archaic civilization itself? Given that the later civilization originated from it, whence and how did it come into being?" His words, "archaic civilization" mean, Dr. Perry explains, the period of "megalithic" or "great stone" buildings found in all parts of the world, "showing such similarities of structure and associations, that they must be the work of people sharing the same culture." He expresses his belief that the culture arose in Egypt, but excavations in Southern Iraq have proved that theory wrong; and the fact remains that no light can be thrown upon the "archaic civilization" unless it is connected, first with the Bible story of Eve, and secondly with the Babylonian evidence, already quoted, that Eve taught Cain all she knew.

My contention is, that by failing to identify the Babylonian Ishtar or Ea with the Biblical Ishshar (or Eve) and Merodach with Cain, Science has missed the key to the problem of the "archaic civilization." For the same reason no explanation has been found for an outstanding feature of the civilization nearly always connected with Eve. This feature is referred to, briefly, in a comparatively recent novel where a "philosopher" is made to say:—

"Wherever agriculture went there went with it traditions of a blood sacrifice. I have never been able to imagine satisfactorily why this should have been so: but very plainly it was so. The Maya, the Aztec religions, were insanely bloody."

The last two words could be applied equally well to the religion of Sargon's court in which, according to Professor Sayce, human sacrifice and the eating of human flesh were practised by the priests in honour of "the gods." He writes further:—

"Unspeakable abominations were practised in the name of Istar which were outdone in other Babylonian cities. The black Istar, as we may call her, was the parody of the goddess of love and the rites with which she was adored and the ministers by whom she was served were equally parodies of the cult which was carried on in Erech. Her priestesses were the witches who plied their calling under the shadow of night and mixed poisonous philtres which drained away the strength of their hapless victims" (*Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, pp. 342-343).

This, then, was the kind of religion Cain's people taught the "food-gatherers," as Dr. Perry calls the aborigines, in contrast to the "food-producers," the civilized race who introduced the culture in many parts of the world, for which no explanation can be found outside the Book of Genesis.

It is hard to believe all that experts tell us about the Maya civilization unless we attribute it to the "wandering stars" of St. Jude's Epistle, by whom I believe the apostle meant the Babylonians, who, to quote his words, went "in the way of Cain."

On page 19 of *The Children of the Sun* an American Archæologist is quoted as saying that the origin of:—

"the Maya civilization is lost in the remote past, not even the shadowy half-lights of tradition illumining its beginnings. The very earliest inscriptions burst literally upon us fully formed, the flower of long-continued astronomical observations expressed in a graphic system of exceeding intricacy. It seems probable, judging from the complexity of the earliest texts, which are in stone, that the hieroglyphic writing must have been developed on some perishable material such as wood, fibre-paper or parchment, the destruction of which by natural processes would satisfactorily explain the entire absence of its earlier stages."

Dr. Perry adds, again quoting an American expert:—

"The Maya Calendar could not have sprung suddenly into being, based as it is upon exact astronomical facts and intricate mathematical calculations. There was no earlier civilization in the American field sufficient to furnish even the fundamental concepts of the calendar. No one can tell how long a period of observing, recording, or correcting was necessary before the Maya year count was made nearly as correct as our own, and far superior to the best that classical Greece and Rome could offer."^[29]

The last remarks recall the "great work of seventy-two books" in Sargon's library, originally called the "Observations" or "Illuminations of Bel."

Another American archæologist announced some years ago (in the monthly journal *Discovery*, June 1925), that:

"Mr. H. J. Spindon of Harvard has discovered definite proofs of the exact year from which the ancient builders of Central America dated their time-count, namely 3343 B.C."

I welcome this date, for, judging by dates already referred to, Naram-Sin could have been alive in 3343 B.C., although Cain was presumably lying in his great stone tomb hidden, by that time, beneath tons of soil brought down by the flooding of the Euphrates. To Naram-Sin, therefore, I ascribe the Babylonian customs accompanying the "archaic civilization" as it spread eastwards and to the Americas; also the knowledge of astronomy, of spiritual matters, of the soul of heaven and hell. As already shown there is abundant evidence that the story of Eve's fall and the punishment was never forgotten in Eastern lands.

Referring especially to Indonesia Dr. Perry writes:—

"Wherever it is possible to examine the ruling classes of the archaic civilization, it is found that they were what is termed gods, that they had the attributes of gods, and that they usually called themselves Children of the Sun." (p. 141).

According to Professor Max Müller's philosophy, these "ruling classes" must have conceived the notion of God. According to Christian ethics, however (as said before), they must have received the notion of gods from someone to whom God had revealed Himself and who had "changed the truth of God into a lie." Who could this have been but Cain?

In India, Dr. Perry tells us, the "ruling classes" are mostly what is known as "hereditary priests" who claim to have had Sky-gods as ancestors and even to hold communication with them at times. Under them are priests called "initiated" to whom they impart as much as they choose of their secret knowledge, all the time changing, as it were, "God's truth into a lie."

In my view, the "hereditary priests" are descendants of priests taken by Cain into the Indus Valley, while the "initiated priests" and all priestesses are largely pre-Adamites.

The "Tantras," or "Litanies," and the legends taught by the Indian priesthood gain much in interest when the Mother-goddess is identified with the "Ishshar" or "Eve" of Genesis; and this in spite of "the silly, senseless and savage element" Max Müller detected in Mythology. In one Indian Tantra, the god Shiva, whom there is reason to connect with Cain, addresses the Great Goddess as follows:—

"Thou art the only Prakriti of the Supreme Soul Brahman, and has sprung from the whole universe O Gracious One whatsoever there is in this world, of things which have and are without motion, from Mahat to an atom, owes its origin to, and is dependent on, Thee.

"Thou art the original of all manifestations; thou art the birth-place of even Us; thou knowest the whole world, yet none know thee."

The litany ends with a string of barbarous names applied to the Goddess; including "Durga" and "Kali," and with the words:—

"Thou art both Subtle and Gross, Manifested and Veiled, formless yet with form; Whom can understand Thee? (*Children of the Sun*, p. 224).

Shiva's words "birthplace of even Us," support Dr. Langdon's opinion that Shiva represents the son of the mother goddess, a theory welcome to me since I take Shiva to represent Cain, and the Goddess to represent his mother.

Dr. Perry explains that the so-called "Hereditary Priests" are regarded as "noble" and "of foreign origin," and I suggest they are almost pure-bred Cainites. In some districts, he says, they dress like women and even "marry men," the last words bringing to mind verses 26 and 27, in St. Paul's first chapter to the Romans, also St. Jude's description of those who "went in the way of Cain," as "raging waves of the sea, wandering stars ... foaming out their own shame."

Dr. Perry writes of the "Hereditary priests" as follows:—

"The priests ... belong to the nobility, a class which, according to the conclusions arrived at, is of immigrant origin. They are descended, in some places ... from stone-using immigrants The evidence agrees in identifying the priests of these islands (the Le ti Moa Lakor group) as the lineal descendants of stone-using immigrants, who are claimed as the founders of villages and the guardian spirits thereof."

He adds: "Some priests use a special language, often unknown to the priestesses," and that the Litanies are "entirely incomprehensible to the laity, indeed," he says, "very few priestesses can chant the whole of a Litany,

but have learned fragments from more experienced members of the priesthood and just sit around when they are chanted and join in when they can" (*ibid.*, p. 146).

Asking why this apparently meaningless ritual survives among people who have no stone-using immigrants among them to ensure its persistence, Dr. Perry writes:—

"Some definite reason must exist for the existence of a profession the members of which chant litanies that they do not understand once such a profession is established in the possession of exclusive knowledge of practical importance, its persistence is assured. But it is necessary to know why it ever became established to discover what is the knowledge which is of so great importance" (*Megalithic Culture in Indonesia*, p. 149).

Had Dr. Perry consulted St. Paul's first letter to the Romans, and also the Epistle of Jude, and had he realised that the name Sargon in all its variations is synonymous with "King Cain," and had he accepted Dr. Waddell's claim that Sargon reigned in the Indus Valley, he would, I feel sure, have believed what I do about the "knowledge of great importance" upon which the Indian religion is based.

Chapter Ten

The Bible says:

"The Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden ... and he took a man, and put him into the garden to dress it and to keep it."

Science says:

"The greatest stride forward ever taken by man was when he devised the craft of agriculture."
(*Children of the Sun*, p. 5).

Many years before excavations in the middle East were started Bible scholars had suggested Armenia as the site of the Garden of Eden, and on page 28 of *Buried Empires*, Mr. Carleton supports the suggestion by writing: "The country between the Caspian and Black Seas might be a promising place to search for the origin of the 'pioneers of culture'," who, it will be remembered he says, "were firmly settled in Southern Iraq by 3000 B.C. In Mr. Carleton's map of South Western Asia there is shown, lying south of Armenia, el-Iraq the narrow valley formerly called Mesopotamia or Babylonia, bordered by two great rivers, both of which are mentioned in the second chapter of Genesis as flowing out of the river of Eden. They are shown separating for some distance, then joining before they reach the Persian Gulf, there forming the swampy desert which was to become the nucleus of Sargon's empire.

Here imagination soars—was it in some way through Eve's almost supernatural vision and a mother's innate pity for her outcast son, that Cain wandered so long to reach the swampy desert which he turned later into the garden of the ancient world by putting into practice his mother's teaching? Was it Cain's gratitude to Eve that caused the oldest monument in the world, the Tower of Eridu, dedicated to Ea, to be erected, on the shore of the Persian Gulf in a little bay near the city of Enoch. It was surely the most probable place for Cain to land.

The potential value of the land, upon which Cain eventually built his city, seems to prove that some mystical influence urged him on to find it. Mere human prescience could not have known of it. Inadvertently, Mr. Carleton gives colour to this idea by writing:—

The deep ploughing and the manuring so familiar to the western farmer are unknown in el-Iraq The Arab's ploughshare is often a piece of hardened wood which barely scratches the surface of the ground; but no more is needed. Given only the indispensable water-supply, the fields of the Middle East will bring

forth abundantly almost of their own accord; so that we need not be astonished to find some of the earliest agriculturists settled on them" (*Buried Empires*, p. 22).

Astonishing, however, that fact remains unless we take seriously the already quoted Babylonian text in which Cain's debt to Eve's super-human wisdom is more than hinted at.

On first reading verses 14-16 of Genesis iv, one naturally assumes that Cain's city of Enoch was built in the "Land of Nod to the East of Eden," but the Bible does not say so, and on looking at the map of South Western Asia in *Buried Empires*, one sees that it could not have been so if, as scholars have suggested Armenia was the site of Eden and if, as the Bible tells us, Cain went east; for Southern Iraq, *i.e.* Babylonia, lies almost due south of Armenia.

Clearly an explanation is needed here, and recent excavations in the desert of Russian Turkestan have offered one. In the lowest stratum of an oasis in that desert, there has been found a small settlement called Anau, containing so many links with Erech and Ur, that Professor King, who wrote about them in 1910, suggested that the "Sumerians," as he calls the pioneers of Babylonian culture, once lived there and were driven by the "periodic dessications and aridities" of the soil to move westwards to the Persian Gulf and across to Southern Iraq.

According to the same authority, Anau was built over, several times in former days, and recently has been thoroughly excavated. In its lowest stratum (he says), there were found ruins of houses built of sun-dried bricks, such as were used in Southern Iraq, terra-cotta figurines of women, which he describes as of the "Babylonian type," fragments of lapis lazuli which was much used in Southern Iraq, and what to me is most significant, "the earliest traces of cultivated wheat or barley," which reminds us that Cain was the first "tiller of the ground" (*Sumer and Akkad*, L. King, pp. 352-357).

Naturally, where Professor King pictures "Sumerians" I see Cain and his followers. Professor King suggests that the reason the "Sumerians built no cities on the Tigris, and made for the west bank of the Euphrates via the Persian Gulf, was because of the height of the banks of the Tigris and the strength and swiftness of its waters. "Hence," he says, "irrigation would have been more difficult there than on the Euphrates" (*ibid.*, p.11). Surely he credited his "Sumerians" with more than human foresight.

Turning to verses 16 and 17 of Genesis iv, one sees that between the records of Cain's dwelling in Nod and his building of Enoch, the birth of his son is mentioned, and this, I like to think, leaves us free to picture for ourselves an unwritten chapter of his life.

Both Lord Byron and a great French painter have depicted Cain going forth from his parents' home accompanied by an Adamite wife and child and what the Bible says about his highly gifted descendants, indicates their purely Adamic birth. On his journey, Cain must have met with pre-Adamites and bent them to his will; for to one who identifies him with Sargon, reads of the great buildings in Sargon's cities and notes the number of graves left in the mounds, where (I shall show), he probably rested for a time, it seems certain that he had crowds of followers.

While dwelling in Anau, Cain and his Adamite wife may, of course, have had many sons and daughters and some of them may have chosen to break away from Cain when he turned west towards the Tigris and Persian Gulf. They may have turned eastwards and made history in China and Japan; probably in Siberia too, for a mysterious civilization was discovered there in the 16th Century A.D. by the Russians.

As regards China and Japan, it is an established fact that "Monotheism," in other words the knowledge of One God, existed in both these countries in the earliest times and was overlaid in both by false gods of various kinds which, as Professor Max Müller claimed, could never have been invented without the previous knowledge of God. The Professor's claim is supported by the following passage:

"The earliest traces of religious thought and practice in China point to the simple monotheism to which gradually was added a worship of the sun, moon, and constellations, and of such individual stars as Canopus, which is now looked upon as the home of God of Longevity" (*Ency. Brit.* 11th edit. "Canis").

Another authority writes:—

"The origin of the Chinese is shrouded in obscurity. Some suppose that the ancestors of the Chinese first lived in the territory south of the Caspian Sea and migrated eastward about the 23rd Century B.C. Others assert that their original home was in Babylonia on the great Euphrates plain, and that they derived many of the elements of their civilization from the ancient Chaldeans" (*Sketch of Chinese History*, Hawkes Pott, p. 23).

Continuing his thesis Mr. Hawkes Pott says that "the earliest rulers brought all the culture of China"; that "to them was due the Golden Age" of China, and that "One of its first rulers was known as the 'Divine Agriculturist'" (*ibid.*, p.23). Cain had certainly well-authenticated claims to such a title.

Mr. Hawkes Pott also says that when the earliest Chinese arrived in the country they found aboriginal tribes there whom they conquered, but never exterminated, so we may picture the Chinese empire, like that of Cain in southern Iraq, founded upon slavery; to quote Professor Sayce's words again: "Slavery was part of the foundation upon which Babylonian society rested" (*Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 67).

In the case of Japan, it seems certain that some of Cain's race passed over to those islands from China for the, so-called, aborigines of Japan were white. A recent writer (Mr. Paul Porter) describes their present representatives as "European people, who were the earliest inhabitants of Japan, the Ainu." He says that while worshipping all kinds of gods, including the bear which they call "the animal of God," with solemn rites and ceremony—"dimly conceived beyond these celestial legions is the Lord of the Universe" before whom their ancestor "Aloina Kamui" is believed to intercede for them. Referring to the several tribes known to have ruled in turn in Japan the same authority says:—

"Before them all was a tribe of immigrants who appear to have crossed from north-eastern Asia before the sea had dug broad channels between the continent and the adjacent islands. These people ... the Ainu ... are usually spoken of as the aborigines of Japan ... they suggest much closer affinity with Europeans than does any other of the types that go to make up the population of Japan."

Mr. Paul Porter's arresting article about the Ainus appeared in *Picture Post* (December 21st, 1946). In it he describes, in detail, the terrible sufferings of the Ainus, conquered after centuries of conflicts with powerful tribes from the Continent of Asia. He says that while the Ainus claim that their name means "man" the Japanese, who hate them corrupt it into "offspring of a man and a dog." This reminds one that the name "Cain" has the same root as our terms Cynic, Canine, the Greek word Kuon for "dog," and Canis the dog-star of which Homer wrote: "Whose breath taints the red air with fever plagues and death" (*Ency. Brit.* 11th ed. "Canis").

Chapter Eleven

"The evidence of a theory increases with the number of facts which it explains, and the precision with which it explains them."—*Imperial Dictionary*, "Theory."

On Mr. Carleton's map of South Western Asia places are marked east of the Tigris, at which, according to my views, Cain encamped for a time as he journeyed southwards. At all those sites great mounds of earth and rubbish have been excavated, each yielding, as Mr. Carleton writes:—

"Remains of the oldest culture known to archæologists which are always found lying upon virgin soil, and, though differing from place to place, may have had a common origin in the remote past—this," Mr. Carleton adds, "is true in particular of the pottery" (*ibid.* p. 33).

The pottery, that humble but unshakeable witness, is known to experts as the Highland, Northern, Painted or Syrian culture. When found in the mounds east of the Tigris, some of it came, according to my views, direct from Cain's first home, while, when found as it has been, near, or in, Sargon's cities of Southern Iraq, it may have been brought there later by Cain's captives of war whom the monuments prove to have been white people, and therefore identifiable as descendants of Adam's younger sons.

As one would expect, pottery found in the lowest stratum of Anau resembles some excavated in Sargon's cities and, since some of the Anau pottery is superior to that of Southern Iraq, Mr. Carleton suggests that it must be of later date. My belief is that it is the oldest of all pottery excavated—made in Cain's first home in his exile nearest therefore to the fountain of all knowledge—and so the best.

Cain's first encampment near the Tigris was, it seems, at Apacheyeh where, in 1930, Professor Mallowan discovered a village of mud-brick huts which he dates third millenium B.C., and below which he found an older settlement with houses of timber and mud, and fragments of "graceful and delicate pottery painted black, white and a tint varying between red and orange" (*Buried Empires*, p. 45).

In the ruins of the lowest village, the one I regard as Cain's, was also found, Mr. Carleton tells us, a shard, now in the British Museum, upon which is "a fine drawing of a two-headed viper coiled to strike," symbolic, one might imagine, of "the mystery of iniquity" which was to flood the world in later times through Cain's agency.

Cain's next resting place after he left Apacheyeh was probably Eshnunna, in a district marked "Warum" on Mr. Carleton's map. There, American excavators made a discovery which deserves to be universally known, as throwing light upon St. Paul's teaching in Romans, that in the beginning, men "changed the glory of God into images like unto men." At Eshnunna (Mr. Carleton suggests) a Semitic speaking race settled before 3000 B.C., and, he says, "on the whole their penetration must have been a peaceful one, and they will have settled companionably enough among the older and more civilised population" (*Buried Empires*, p. 111).

The theory of Semitic speaking people settling in Eshnunna fits in, of course, with my belief that Cain encamped there for many years, but, according to the Bible, any human beings he found already there must have been pre-Adamites who were easily subjugated.

The date 3000 B.C., proposed by Mr. Carleton for the Eshnunna settlement, is much too late to suit my views, based as they are upon the dates 4000 and 3800 B.C., provided respectively by Bishop Ussher and the seal of Nabonidas for Adam's creation and Sargon's reign in Babylonia. As I see things, Cain must have camped at Eshnunna at some time between those dates (so vitally important for my purpose). It seems well, therefore, to stress the fact that Mr. Carleton, who ignores both dates, tacitly admits (as we have seen Dr. Waddell did plainly) ^[30] that without Sargon's date of 3800 B.C., all early dates are merely "tentative" ... "little more," he adds, "than convenient and conventional labels" (*Buried Empires*, p.70).

When the dates 4000 and 3800 B.C. are accepted, and Cain identified with Sargon, the following details regarding the discoveries at Eshnunna should, I think, appeal to most people. Writing about a "small stone temple" found at Eshnunna, Mr. Carleton gives it the approximate date of 3000 B.C. and ascribes it to the hypothetical civilised race who, he says preceded the "Semitic Akkadians." He describes it as "not unlike an ordinary dwelling house and far less impressive than the older temples at Uruk^[31] (which belonged to Sargon's time.) He says it:—

"consisted of a lobby with stairs leading to the flat roof, and an ante-chamber containing the laver in which the worshipper must cleanse himself before entering the presence of the gods, and a large central room or court round which were the three actual sanctuaries apparently dedicated to the god Abu ('Lord of the Plants') and his wife the mother-goddess and their son"

These three being, I hold, the first of the "images like unto men," spoken of by St. Paul—and (to put it plainly) caricatures of Adam, Eve and Abel.

Mr. Carleton remarks that the figures he describes "have given us a perfect idea of what the Sumerians of 3000 B.C., actually looked like." "The best of the statues," he says, "are undoubtedly careful portraits of living men. If their originals could be raised before us in the flesh, we should know them immediately." To my mind, as said before, the figures of "the god Abu and his consort" in the photograph reproduced here from *Buried Empires*, are simply Cain's caricatures of his parents. It seems so obvious that "Abu," whose name means "father," represented Adam, and the goddess and son, Eve and Abel. Mr. Carleton continues:—

"These shrines consisted of narrow rooms, each with a brick pedestal for the idol at the far end. Buried beneath the floor of the goddess's sanctuary were found a number of most interesting objects which had been consecrated to her as offerings, and then disposed of in this way when they were no longer needed. These included a lovely necklace of serpentine and alabaster; fragments of the same materials, seals of various fine stones and several broken human figures exquisitely carved from shell and mother-of-pearl and intended as inlays for plaques of stone or hard asphalt."

Commenting on these objects he writes:—

"The artistic merit of all these was very high, but the discovery paled into unimportance beside that made beneath the floor of Abu's shrine Here, carefully buried, was found a hoard of no less than a dozen magnificent stone statues including the actual idols of the god and goddess. Though crude in some respects these limestone and alabaster images ranging in height from one to two and a half feet, astonish one both by the technical competence and the true æsthetic feeling which their workmanship displays In one respect they show an amazing virtuosity on the part of the sculptor of five thousand years ago, for the legs, instead of being carved in a single piece as is the case with all other ancient statues, are cut boldly separate, the feet wide apart, and yet support the whole weight of the statue without the aid of any plinth or strut" (*Buried Empires*, p. 86).

These marvellously accomplished but (as regards the faces) grotesque statues seem to me a further proof of Cain's mocking humour. Since the statue of the "son" is not mentioned in *Buried Empires* one assumes that it was not identified as such. One cannot help wondering if the statue of a pig-faced man was ever dug up?

Mr. Carleton says that the Eshnunna temple is "far less impressive than those dug up at Erech sacred to the 'Sky-god' (as Anu was sometimes called) and the Mother-goddess." I claim that it was their forerunner and the first pagan temple in the world, which would account for the fact, to be enlarged upon later, that the same arrangement of three shrines for idols (mentioned in the preceding page) was found in the temple at Erech to the Mother-goddess.

As the oldest of all statues known to us, and among the most skilful of all ancient works, the value of the Eshnunna statues, which are now in Chicago, is enormous. To one who regards them as contemporary with Adam, and possibly the handiwork of Cain, they are objects of awe and wonder. Who can doubt that the stone house by the Tigris in which they were found, was the scene of the ceremony referred to by some mocking scribe, and already quoted:—

"Isthar with Anu the king into a noble seat they raised and in the government of heaven they fixed" (*Chaldean Genesis*, p. 109).

Having decided that the Eshnunna village was built about 3000 B.C. and seeing that Babylonian art became decadent about that time, archæologists find themselves forced to suggest that "a renaissance of art" took place in Sargon's reign which they date about 2600 B.C., when as Mr. Carleton writes "new master-pieces were produced" (p. 132).^[32] Is it not easier to credit Sargon's period with all the fine prehistoric art of Babylonia, to accept his monumental date and to identify him with Cain.

From Eshnunna Cain probably travelled on to a place marked "Susa" upon Mr. Carleton's map where, according to that author, "the first inhabitants of Persia installed themselves, and where in later times was enacted the story of Mordecai and Queen Esther." There, Cain's stay must have been a long one for 2,000 graves have been excavated. "From these," Carleton says, "a huge quantity of specimens of their handiwork have been obtained proving for one thing that the first settlers could produce linen almost as fine as the very best we possess to-day," proving, too, that they had discovered the reflecting capacity of polished metal, and used copper mirrors not altogether dissimilar to the bronze mirrors used in Japan until quite recently. "Most remarkable, however, of all the objects found in the graveyards of Susa" (the same writer remarks) "were the pots." These he describes as of "yellow-white pottery decorated with designs of brilliant glossy black" and as "a joy for ever." Of the designs he writes:—

" They are abstract, one might say intellectual ... in character, the work of a people who took pleasure in the idea, rather than the reality of what they say Geometrical elements figure in all the patterns ... elaborate and harmonious arrangements of triangles, rectangles, diamonds, zigzags and segmented circles" (*Buried Empires*, p. 36).

Mr. Carleton goes on to mention designs of things, creatures, quivers of arrows, tree-branches, men, goats, birds and dogs and he gives his opinion that the result is never "absurd or childish" that on the contrary, from a purely decorative point of view it is more successful than any laborious "copying" of the subject could hope to be. He ends by saying that if the adverse critics of modern "non-representational art " were acquainted with the rudiments of archæology, they would know that these revolutionary artists were working in a tradition that is as old as human intelligence itself, and that created some of the world's first masterpieces. To me, it seems possible that many of our revolutionary artists have found their inspiration in the British Museum.

Chapter Twelve

"When kingship came down from heaven, the kingship was at Eridu."—Priests' text.

Yellow-white pottery of Susa has also been dug up at Karmanshah about 150 miles above Susa, and at Persepolis, 300 miles below that city, once the seat of the great Persian kings.

One gathers, since that oldest pottery is not said to have been found on any more eastern site, that Cain turned west from Persepolis towards the Persian Gulf as he had done many years before, when he left Anau. Shards of painted pottery have been dug up at a place called Bundar Bushire on the Persian Gulf and this was probably the place of his embarkation.

Presumably he spent some years there, making preparations to cross the Gulf. Silver and wooden models of boats, found in graves in southern Iraq, were probably sacred memorials of his arrival at Eridu where, as already said, he seems to have built a monument to his mother.

Sir Leonard Woolley describes how, standing on the summit of the mound of Ur, he could see to the north, west and south, "a waste of unprofitable sand" and on the South-west: "a grey upstanding pinnacle, the ruins of the staged tower of the sacred city of Eridu," which he says "the Sumerians believed to be the oldest city upon the earth" (*Ur of the Chaldees*, p. 13).

Quoting what he calls "the misleading king-list" of the priest Nur-Ninsubur who lived about 1984 B.C., Mr. Carleton begins it as follows:—

"When kingship came down from heaven, the kingship was at Eridu. At Eridu Alulim was king, he ruled 36,000 years. Two kings ruled 648,000 years. Eridu was overthrown (*Buried Empires*, p. 31).

These lines well exemplify the absurdity of the whole list. I take them to be an obscure allusion to Cain's arrival in Eridu, and to his, and his son's long reigns.

Near the "sacred tower" of Eridu^[33] a building, supposed to have been a temple, has been excavated. This, I imagine, was Cain's temporary home while irrigation and agriculture were being carried out, and great buildings erected on his chosen site for the city of Enoch or Erech, called after his eldest son (Genesis iv, 17).

Before Erech was habitable, it seems, a small settlement of mud and wattle huts existed upon an island in the marsh about four miles from that on which Ur was eventually built. Giving the settlement the name of Al 'Ubaid, Sir Leonard Woolley says that, because it was never built over, it has thrown much light upon the first settlers in southern Iraq. Both Erech and Ur are now known to have been built over such settlements.

Referring to his discoveries at Al 'Ubaid, Sir Leonard Woolley writes:—

"It was clear that these people cultivated the soil and reaped their harvests of grain. They kept domesticated cattle, sheep and goats: they fished in the marshes, (for we found fish-hooks and model boats), and judging from fragments of painted terra-cotta figures of men and women they seem to have painted or tattooed their bodies; stone weights showed that the loom was used, so they had advanced beyond the stage when men wore only skins of animals and for luxury they had beads cut out of shell or rudely chipped from transparent white quartz, carnelian and obsidian" (*Ur of the Chaldees*, p. 1).

From these words one gets a vivid idea of the existence led by Cain and his followers while the irrigation and agriculture credited to him by the Babylonians were carried out.

In one cuneiform text "Asari"^[34] (which according to Sayce was one of Merodach's fifty names) is addressed as "gladdener of the corn and the creator of wheat and barley," while "Merodach" is described in another text as "Donor of fruitfulness, founder of agriculture and creator of grain and plants, who causes the green herb to spring forth" (*Origin of Bible Traditions*, Clay, p. 211).

Thus, as I see things, Babylonian mythographers harped upon Cain's story.

Referring to Al 'Ubaid, Sir Leonard Woolley tells of the discovery there of "a very early and very remarkable building" excavated among huts built of wood and mud but itself built of the small bricks only used in the earliest times (p. 91 of *Ur of the Chaldees*).

This brick building, he says, had possessed a staircase the treads of which were "great slabs of white limestone, the first example of the use of stone for building found in southern Iraq ... except for a similar flight of stairs found in the ruins of Eridu, (the present Abu-Shahrein) 12 miles south of Ur."

My conviction is that the building was the workshop of Cain's descendant Tubal-Cain "the instructor of every artificer in brass and iron" (Genesis iv, 22). And that a statue of Cain of which the head found in the ruins of Nineveh was executed there.

This recalls the fact that Sir Leonard Woolley writes about "a large diorite statue of a man wearing a sheep-skin petticoat" which he says was found near the Ziggurat of Ur (considered to be the model from which was built "the Biblical Tower of Babel"). Had the head from Nineveh been excavated when Sir Leonard wrote *Ur of the Chaldees*, he might have connected it with the headless statue as it is now possible to do. Writing of the head Sir Leonard says:—

"The head was missing: It had been broken off deliberately in antiquity, and the stump of the neck was polished as if by contemptuous caresses of innumerable hands" (p. 106, *Ur of the Chaldees*).

Presumably Professor Mallowan did not know about this headless statue found at Ur, nor does it seem, from what he says in the following passage, did Dr. Campbell Thompson. The passage runs:—

"The head was found lying loose in the soil on an Assyrian mud-platform within the limits of the Temple of Ishtar, and it *must* at some time have been preserved in an Assyrian building; Dr. Campbell Thompson suggests that the head was part of Asshur-bani-pal's loot from Elam" (*Iraq*, p. 105).

Naturally I regard it as Asshur-bani-pal's loot from Ur.

We have seen that Asshur-bani-pal is known to have sent people from Nineveh to bring back objects of interest from Sargon's cities; and can picture "his collectors joy" at receiving the metal head if it was a portrait of Cain; that could explain why it was placed by him in the temple of the goddess Ishtar, the deified representative of Cain's mother and his own ancestress. If, as Sir Leonard Woolley suggests, the statue had been at first contemptuously treated it was natural; for Assyrians of Shem's race might well have looked down upon anything to do with one whose ancestor had not been saved in Noah's Ark.

For centuries after Cain's period the priests of Ur, it would seem, prowled about Cain's cities of southern Iraq, judging by certain finds there including a frieze at Al 'Ubaid which Sir Leonard says was elaborate and showed fine workmanship: "It consisted for most of its length of a procession of cows carved in limestone, probably once painted or in shell, which was probably left white ... in the centre was a scene in which human figures are introduced; on one side of a reed-built byre ... men are seated on low stools milking cattle; the man sitting under the cow's tail milking her from behind"—an impossible operation an expert tells me—but characteristic in my opinion of the priests' sense of humour (*Ur of the Chaldees*, p.97). Another obviously humorous object is described in Woolley's book as a "small relief badly weathered ... but curiously interesting It represents a high-prowed boat made of reeds tied together and having an arched cabin or canopy amidships—a boat not unlike the silver models found in tombs at Ur."

"On one side a man was shown standing in the stern and a sow in the cabin, on the other two fish took the place of the man and a goose that of the sow."

"Probably," Sir Leonard adds, "the little object was dedicated in a temple by one of the marshfolk and pictures the sort of life he led, for fish, wild geese and wild boar are the staple products of the marsh-land; it was a strong temptation to call it a picture of Noah's Ark; but though that passed as a jest in camp the other is the more likely explanation."

Even more absurd to my mind is—"the plaque of Nina, king of Lagash, his sons and courtiers," which is to be seen photographed in *Sumer and Akkad* by Professor King.

Another article presumably meant to make things difficult for posterity is recorded in *Ur of the Chaldees*, where it is taken seriously. It is a small oblong tablet of white limestone bearing the inscription: "Anni-padda King of Ur has built this for his Lady Nin-kharsag." "Anni-padda," I claim, represented Cain, and "Lady Nin-kharsag," Cain's Mother.

Can it be doubted that the Babylonians were bent upon obscuring the identify of their great founder? A President of the Anthropological Society in London suggested something of the kind in a lecture when he said:—

"There are huge gaps in our knowledge of the history of the human race, and it has been the pleasure of mankind in all ages to people these gaps with jugglers and bogies," (Colonel Lane Fox, May, 1875).

So far as I can see, the huge gap in early Babylonian history, was caused by the phenominally long reign of King Cain and his son which the priests did their utmost to wipe out of men's minds. Hence the admittedly misleading king-lists full of absurdities and the fictitious names in the Ur Cemetery.

Chapter Thirteen

"Sargina king of Erech who wields power over them of Ur."—*The First Bible*, Conder.

The above text supports my belief that Ur was built by Cain as a kind of monastery for his devil-worshipping priests—"they who followed in the way of Cain," as St Jude describes Cain's followers. We have seen that Ur possessed a Ziggurat, and Sir Leonard Woolley found that in that city Bel was called Nannar or Sin-the Moon-god, Uplifter-of-horns, and was said to have a wife called the Moon-goddess.

It seems that Ur was ruled by "Isags" or "Patesis" words meaning "high-priests," but, as the above text shows, Sargon was their sovereign lord; and we learn from Sir Leonard that at one time Sargon's daughter took part in the temple ritual as high-priestess. Sir Leonard writes about "an object discovered in the ruins of the Moon-goddess's temple at Ur" and describes it as:—

"A disk of alabaster—the moon's disk—on one side of which is a much damaged relief showing a stepped altar, in front of which a priest is pouring libations; behind the priest stands a female figure in long flounced garments, and behind her two attendants with offerings: on the back is a written dedication by the daughter of Sargon" (*Ur of the Chaldees*, p. 110).

To one who believes that Sargon was Cain and that he founded the Ur Cemetery, it seems natural enough that his daughter was in Ur, also that three of her servants were buried in the cemetery which Sir Leonard Woolley says was founded about 3500 B.C., when according to the accepted Bible date for Adam, Cain could have been alive. But since Sir Leonard says that the cemetery was "falling out of use in 3200 B.C.," what can be made of his remark on page 113, of the same book, namely that "king Sargon reigned from 2630 to 2575 B.C."—that is to say about 600 years after the "closing down" of the royal cemetery in which he found graves of Sargon's daughter's servants Here surely is an anachronism due to the change of Sargon's date from the fourth to the third millenium B.C.

The City of Ur, against the south-eastern wall of which the now famous Royal Cemetery gradually grew up was first, as Sir Leonard Woolley explains, a primitive settlement like Al 'Ubaid consisting of mud huts in the remains of which have been found fragments of the fine painted pottery excavated in all the mounds where, I hold, Cain had rested; and amongst the remains have also been found tablets inscribed with archaic writing much older than any inscriptions found in the Cemetery, or anywhere else, except in the lowest stratum of Erech.

The mud-huts, we are told, were soon built over by brick houses, and those, as they crumbled and fell, were replaced by others, a process which Sir Leonard says went on for centuries until Ur stood, a proud city with immensely strong walls, on a hill made out of its own ruins. Against the south-east wall, meanwhile, a huge rubbish dump had been growing up composed partly of clay and silt cast up by the periodic floodings of the Euphrates which at that time ran close to Sargon's cities, and partly of rubbish thrown down from the walls of Ur; and, as Sir Leonard writes: "It was into the rubbish that the royal and other graves had been dug," he adds, "and the rubbish extended down below the graves" (p. 23, *ibid.*).

The same authority continues: "Rubbish mounds 40 feet high must represent a long period of time, a period certainly to be reckoned in centuries," and this opinion suits my theory that Cain and his son Naram-Sin reigned over, "them of Ur" for several centuries before the royal tombs were built, and in the largest of which Cain was buried. The tombs had, it seems, been protected for some time by silt and clay thrown up over them by an unusually violent flooding of the Euphrates, mingled with house-hold rubbish thrown over the walls of Ur, and it was in this thick mass that the so-called "commoners" graveyard was made.

In the graveyard, Sir Leonard tells us, he found more than 1,400 graves, most of which had been robbed of their contents, but it was there that were found the cylinder seals of the servants of Sargon's daughter, one of them "intact in a grave."

It seems certain that the "robbers" were no ordinary ones judging by the valuables they left scattered in every part of the cemetery; to my mind they were priests from the town of Ur, who were searching for the royal bodies they knew had been buried there long before, and I hope to show they eventually found them.

Describing his excavation of the cemetery Sir Leonard writes (first explaining that the robbers were in the habit of building tunnels or "shafts" down into the mound, evidently searching for hidden graves):—

"At the very end of the season 1926-7 two important discoveries were made. At the bottom of an earth shaft, amongst masses of copper weapons, there was found the famous gold dagger of Ur" (*ibid.*, p. 42). And describing it as a wonderful weapon, he writes of: "its blade of gold, its hilt of lapis lazuli decorated with gold studs, and its sheath of gold beautifully worked with an openwork pattern derived from plaited grass. With the dagger, he says, was another object scarcely less remarkable, a cone-shaped reticule of gold ornamented with a spiral pattern and lancet, and pencil, also of gold. Nothing like these things had ever before come from the soil of Mesopotamia, and they revealed an art hitherto unsuspected and gave promise of future discoveries outstripping all our hopes" (p. 42).

Soon after the discovery of the golden dagger the excavators made another discovery. Sir Leonard writes: "We came upon slabs and blocks of rough limestone which seemed to form a paving over the pit's base. This was an astonishing thing, because there is no stone in the Euphrates delta, not so much as a pebble and to obtain blocks of limestone such as these it is necessary to go some thirty miles away into the desert As the season was nearly at an end we could do no more than clear the surface of the 'pavement' and leave its fuller examination for the next autumn" (p. 43).

Before resuming excavations the next year, however, Sir Leonard had come to the conclusion that what he had thought was a pavement was more probably the roof of a building, which might be a royal tomb, and he soon found he was right. He writes:—

"We had found a stone-built underground structure which had indeed been the tomb of a king, but a rubbish-filled tunnel led from near the surface to the broken roof, robbers had been there before us, and except for a few scattered fragments of a gold diadem and some decayed copper pots there was nothing left for us to find" (p. 44).

After describing the two-chambered structure he had found, Sir Leonard comments:—

"Nothing of the kind had ever been found before" (it must be remembered that the temples at Erech were excavated later) "and the light thrown on the architectural knowledge of this remote period might well atone for the loss of the tomb's contents."

From the remains of the royal tombs, of which there seem to have been seven, Sir Leonard concluded that "the architect was familiar with all the basic principles of construction known to us to-day" (p. 67). Another intriguing fact, mentioned later by Sir Leonard, is, that next to the largest stone-tomb was a smaller one which, he says was that of "Queen Shub-ad,"^[35] this tomb was the only one left unopened by the supposed robbers, although rich booty might have been expected in it, for her name and title inscribed on a cylinder seal was found hidden in the shaft outside.

Devoting several pages to accounts of human victims and animals, all sacrificed to the dead royalties and lying in great numbers round their tombs, Sir Leonard returns to the subject of the king's tomb, telling us (p. 86) of the so-called "Standard of Ur" found there, leaning against the skeleton of a soldier.

In the photograph of the standard the reader may easily detect, in the little figures silhouetted in shell with a background of lapis lazuli, relieved here and there with red, the love of caricature exhibited in all the priest's work; the standard's presence in the king's tomb may safely, in my opinion, be put down to the so-called robbers who descended by shafts and tunnels to plunder the royal tombs; them I unhesitatingly write down as priests of

the first or second millenium B.C. It is known that gold was believed in ancient times to have magic qualities. Superstitious fear on the part of the priests may have preserved for us the golden treasures now in the British Museum.

Continuing his search for the body of the king, Sir Leonard came upon a wooden box, containing two daggers "of which the blades were of gold and the hilts decorated with gold studs, and between them a white shell cylinder seal inscribed with the words Mes-kalam-dug the King" (p. 69). Near the daggers was found a wooden coffin containing the body of a man but with nothing on it to connect it with a royal person; therefore, Sir Leonard writes: "we felt sure that we had not yet found the king's grave." The name "Mes-kalam-dug," meaning "Hero of the Good land," was soon after found without the title of King, on two golden bowls and a lamp we may thank the mischievous priests, to whom I ascribe all the confusion in the royal cemetery, for the omission of the word "King," which helps to prove their determination to puzzle any possible future discoverer of the king's body. It certainly puzzled Sir Leonard Woolley, who finding it, as he relates he did, in a wooden coffin buried in what he describes as "the shaft of the largest of all the stone-built tombs" and with "no subsidiary burials, no hint of human sacrifice," remarked after expatiating upon the gorgeous contents of the coffin: "Had the royal tombs not been discovered, this would probably have been hailed as a king's grave" (p. 77).

To anyone concluding, as I do, that in this wooden coffin hidden away in the shaft leading down into the largest stone-tomb lay the remains of the first-born of mankind, the account of an expert eye-witness like Sir Leonard Woolley, must I think be acceptable. He writes:—

"the body lay in normal fashion on its right side: round the waist was a broad belt of silver, now decayed, from which hung a gold dagger and a whetstone of lapis lazuli fixed on a gold ring; in front of the waist was a solid mass of lapis and gold beads, hundreds in all; between the hands was placed a bowl of heavy gold, a larger oval gold bowl lay close by, and near the elbow a gold lamp in the form of a shell, while yet another gold bowl stood behind the head. Against the right shoulder was a double axe-head of electrum, and an electrum axe-head of normal type was by the left shoulder; behind the body there were jumbled together in a heap a gold head-dress, bracelets, beads, and amulets, lunate ear-rings, and spiral rings of gold wire."

"The bones were so far decayed," Sir Leonard continues, "that there was, here, none of the grimness of a skeleton, only a few strips of crumbling brown which served to show the attitude of the dead man, and the prevailing note was struck rather by the gold, clean as when it was put into the grave; and most of all was the eye taken by the helmet which covered the rotten fragments of the skull. It was a helmet of beaten gold made to fit low over the head with cheek-pieces to protect the face, and it was in the form of a wig, the locks of hair hammered up in relief, the individual hairs shown by delicate engraved lines. Parted down the middle the hair covers the head in flat wavy tresses and is bound round a twisted fillet; behind it is tied into a little chignon, and below the fillet hangs in rows of formal curls about the ears, which are rendered in high relief and are pierced so as not to interfere with the hearing; similar curls on the cheek-pieces represent whiskers; round the edge of the metal are small holes for the laces which secured inside it a padded cap, of which some traces yet remained."

Sir Leonard comments:—

"As an example of goldsmith's work this is the most beautiful thing we have found in the cemetery. Finer than the gold daggers or the heads of bulls, and if there were nothing else by which the art of these ancient Sumerians (*sic*) could be judged we should still, on the strength of it alone, accord them high rank in the roll of civilised races" (*ibid.*, p. 76).

Continuing, Sir Leonard alludes to the name "Mes-kalam-dug hero of the Good Land" which was inscribed on the two gold bowls and the gold lamp, in the same grave as the helmet. Because the word "King" was absent from these inscriptions he decided that in spite of its gorgeous surroundings the remains could not be those of

the king for whom the largest stone tomb had been built. This opinion was presumably strengthened by his discovery of another seal outside the tomb, upon which the words "Mes-kalam-dug the king" were inscribed.

Since no Mes-kalem-dug can be proved to have existed I regard inscriptions with his name attached to be simply priestly forgeries, and marvel that confidence has been placed in them. Not for a moment do I believe that the name of the regally buried lady found in the undisturbed tomb next the king's was Shub-ad, though it was inscribed upon a seal nearby though not in the tomb itself. Instead it was lying in the "filling of the shaft rather above the roof of the chamber her remains lay in." Whatever the lady's name may have been she lay in state upon a wooden bier, a gold cup in her hand, wearing a cloak covered with beads of gold, silver, lapis lazuli, carnelian, agate and chalcedony and surrounded by other treasures including a marvellous head-dress, which can now be seen in the British Museum, beautifully reconstructed by the late Lady Woolley, and photographed in *Ur of the Chaldees*, (p. 62).

Deeper mystery surrounds the body of a woman found in a commoner's grave, but wearing a golden head-dress made "familiar to us," as Sir Leonard writes, "from those in the royal tombs" and with a harp beside her like those in the royal tombs. Sir Leonard decided that she was some "private person" because she had no sacrificed attendants visible.

To me the presence of a royal or noble skeleton in the so-called commoners cemetery is suspicious and points to another of the priests' monkey tricks. In the same suspicious spirit I read Sir Leonard's account of one more unexpected discovery in the "commoners" part of the cemetery. Hazzarding no opinion about it he writes:—

"It was a man's grave, and he wore not one but six of the oval gold frontlets on his head, heavy gold bracelets on his arms, gold finger-rings, quantities of beads, and with these had a gold amulet in the form of a standing goat very finely cast and two lapis lazuli cylinder seals mounted in gold: he also wore a single gold ear-ring, which seems to have been the male fashion since single ear-rings often occur in men's graves."

Sir Leonard merely remarks: "This was an exceptional case, so much so that it emphasised rather than redeemed the general character of the cemetery." The reader will not be much surprised, I imagine, to read that my first belief was that this seemingly misplaced body was that of Sargon's son Naram-Sin. How it came to be there is open to conjecture. Archæology throws no light upon the matter. Naram-Sin's splendid "Stele of Victory" can be seen in the Museum of the Louvre in Paris and is considered one of the finest and most ancient of Babylonian monuments. Had the excavators of the cemetery found there a helmet adorned with two bulls' horns like that worn by Naram-Sin upon his monument his identity with the nameless warrior would have seemed more certain ... a nobly proportioned giant he stands among dwarf-like enemies some of whom he has slain while others are crying for mercy. Just such a scene may often have been enacted more than a thousand years later when the tall blue-eyed Aryans invaded the Indus Valley.

Granting that Naram Sin enjoyed the longevity of Bible patriarchs before the flood, or the 570 years ascribed to Cain by ancient Jewish writers, he could well have lived to return to Southern Iraq, after Cain's death, arriving when the royal tombs were hidden as before described. If it were not for further evidence, to be given later, I should believe there had been foul play. Inscriptions prove that the priesthood ruled Babylonia after Sargon's death; would the priests of Ur have welcomed Cain's son and heir?

Chapter Fourteen

"Science does not know its Debt to Imagination."—Emerson.

To make Naram-Sin the centre of interest, in this my last chapter, imagination must be resorted to. There is nothing about him, it seems certain, in the Bible but the cuneiform inscriptions show his importance, not only by

his title "king of the four quarters of the world"^[36] but also by proving that, like his father, he was deified by the priests who were the scribes and sculptors of the country. Professor L. King writes:—

"In nearly every text of Naram-Sin, the determination for deity precedes his name, and in some contemporary seal inscriptions he is even called the 'god of Agade' (*Sumer and Akkad*, p. 251).

That which makes Naram-Sin worth our consideration is, of course, his relationship to Sargon whom we have identified with Cain. A grandson of our first parents who became wise as "gods,"^[37] may well be pictured as almost supernatural—possessed of knowledge of things celestial and terrestrial, also of longevity, immense energy and brain power. Nothing less than the existence of such a being can explain the almost simultaneous rise of a prehistoric empire in the eastern hemisphere, vaster even than King Cain's, and rich in great cities whose ruins are regarded by archæologists as foremost among the unsolved problems of the past.

Obviously any relic of Naram-Sin who lived in the fourth millenium B.C. must be sought for among the remains of the Archaic Civilisation of "the Children of the Sun," and all we need do is to follow the trail of the Serpent, his father's familiar spirit. This is not difficult, thanks to several books, lying beside me, from which I take the liberty of borrowing certain passages that serve to support my theories. They all tell of Angkor, a great collection of ruins in Cambodia, the south-eastern corner of Asia, covering sixty square miles and hidden in the midst of a trackless swampy jungle full of dangerous wild beasts. From descriptions and photographs in the said books I learn of a vast building now called Angkor Vat separated from the rest of the ruins by a moat and park. Seeing that it is very different from the other buildings, has better withstood the assault of time,^[38] and is, in fact, as unique in its way as the mosaic building at Erech which I ascribe to Cain's genius. I feel justified in assuming it to be the palace of Cain's son and the whole of Angkor to be the capital of his empire.

In his fascinating book *Escape with Me*, Sir Osbert Sitwell, one of the first Englishmen to visit Angkor between the two world wars, introduces the serpent by saying that the modern French road, by which he was driven to Angkor through the jungle:—

"incorporates a huge and ancient causeway of golden stone, ending on a carved serpent, with rearing, fanlike head; a causeway that, in addition to belonging clearly to some complete architectual system, but one never before encountered, is constructed on a scale so much greater than that of the road itself, that he who passes it is obliged to deduce that he must be drawing near to some place of great former power and wealth" (*Escape with Me*, p. 82).

Photographs show that the stone causeway ending in a serpent leads right up to the principal entrance of Angkor Vat, through a park, over a moat said to be 6,060 yards in perimeter, and under "a magnificent portico" (*Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., "Angkor").

By explaining that the nine-headed snake on the causeway represents the royal "Naga" or "Cobra," Sir Osbert Sitwell offers, at once, a tangible link between Angkor Vat and the Babylonian "Nagas" of the Indus Valley, who marched under banners decorated with pictures of a cobra snake (chapter 5). The same author writes of a "paved terrace" at Angkor Vat which "still retains its balustrade of stone serpents," and is approached by "majestic flights of steps flanked by rearing golden serpents" (*Escape with Me*, p. 105).

As if the serpents were not thought enough to guard this unique building, four huge golden lions form part of its architecture and can be dimly seen in the photograph of Angkor Vat taken from the air, and reproduced in the book before me by Dr. Quaritch Wales, Field Director of the Greater-India Research Committee (*Towards Angkor*, p. 234).

To add to the air of royal exclusiveness presented by Angkor Vat there exists, a mile distant from it, a great walled enclosure containing massive stone buildings of a more primitive style, one having golden towers. All

these buildings were found much over-grown by the trunks and vast rooting branches of the Banyan tree and trails of creeping greenery from the encroaching jungle.

The French expert P. Jeannerat de Beerski, sent in 1919 by his government to report upon Angkor, describes Angkor Vat in his book *Angkor* as "one of the most impressive sights which can enchant human life" and says "it is unlike anything else on earth," adding "one cannot at first master one's feelings or express them in words." He writes: "Oh, the superb halls The superb exhibition of art and religion The supreme achievement of a school of learning and philosophy What the Sistine Chapel is to Christianity, and Boroboudour to Buddhism, Angkor is to Vishnuism—namely, a sanctuary where the chief dogmas and lores of a faith are pictorially displayed with consummate feeling, strength and perfection" (*Angkor*, p. 259).

From these words it will be guessed that, not knowing as it is now known that the Cambodians worshipped their chief god in brick shrines on artificial hills or sometimes in towers, M. de Beerski assumed that Angkor Vat was a temple, and it is often so described in other books. He admits, however, that "some archæologists found analogies between Angkor Vat and royal palaces." As said before I believe it to have been the palace of Naram-Sin.

Sir Osbert Sitwell suggests that the wealth needed for the building of the Angkorean edifices, came from the sale to China of the beautiful Cambodian king-fisher birds,^[39] for whose benefit the countless lakes, moats, ponds and fountains were constructed. Here I shall venture a suggestion of my own—that the friendly intercourse between the Cambodians and Chinese (known to have existed) came from the fact that in Eastern Asia, Cain's descendants from Anau in Russian Turkestan, met with his descendants from Babylonia and from the Indus colony founded by King Cain (see chapter 7).

The Cambodians' Empire is now said to have acquired the province of Funan from China, embraced the Malay Peninsular, colonised the Islands of Sumatra, Java and Bali, also parts of Borneo; and my own opinion is that it extended across the sea to Central America as well. Sir Osbert Sitwell refers to the "disturbing similarity" of the Maya art of America to that of Cambodia^[40] and in a joint book by two scholars the date of the celebrated Maya calendar is given as 3343 B.C., when Naram-Sin could have been alive. We read:—

"The Mayas made use of a system of reckoning from a mythical recreation of the world that fell, according to the correlation followed in this book, in 3343 B.C." (page 209, *History of the Maya*, T. Gann, F.R.G.S. and Eric Thompson, Assistant Curator, Field Museum, Chicago).

Since China and Cambodia traded together from the earliest times it seems likely that enterprising Cambodians, granted permission to pass through China, crossed the Behring Straits at a time when the forty intervening miles were covered with ice. This may explain the rather Arctic style of dress on some of the figures in Maya bas-reliefs. The marvellously high grade of the Maya culture has already been noticed, also their cruel customs resembling those of King Cain's court.

Other signs exist that the Mayas derived their culture from the builders of Angkor. While Dr. Wales shows that the Balinese have always burned incense to their gods, a coloured reproduced photograph has lately been published in which modern Mayas are seen on the steps of a Christian church holding censers and below is printed "Where the Maya Indian burns the incense his ancestors once offered to native gods ... the incense is prehistoric" (photo by Julian Huxley, words by Peter Smithers, *Picture Post*, May 28th, 1948).

Describing the ancient instruments of the Balinese religion Dr. Wales says they "include the chalice, rosary, handbell, censer, holy water and oil-lamp" (*Towards Angkor*, p. 208). "These implements," the doctor adds "have been with justice compared with those of the Catholic Church."

Bali which forms part of the Cambodian empire is, according to Dr. Wales, "the last outpost of living Hindus." He says that the Balinese have both Buddhist and Brahman priests, but that there is little to distinguish them

except that the Brahmans wear "chignons" and the Buddhists, short hair (*ibid.* p. 207).

It will be shown later that the Brahman's religion is based upon the worship of Shiva, (or Siva) the representative of Cain (see chapter 4).

Unfortunately some authors are fixing Anno Domini dates for Angkor, which, if they could be substantiated, would shatter all my theories about Naram-Sin's connection with it. Therefore, my gratitude goes out to Sir Osbert Sitwell, who refuses to accept those admittedly conjectural dates, writing:—

"Specialists on the subject assert that to-day they can put an accurate date to each great relic, but despite the remarkable taste and judgment they have shown, to this claim I humbly take leave to demur for, there appertains to the power of correctly allotting a work to an epoch a quality as in diagnosis, almost mediumistic, difficult adequately to explain on the level of what we know" (*Escape with Me*).

The rashness of fixing dates for the Angkor ruins becomes very evident on reading Dr. Wales's words: "The Indian colonists kept no written records of their doings, and archæology can tell us nothing before the second century of the Christian era."

Dr. Wales also tells that though "the Indians once had the monopoly of colonisation in southern Asia, early in the Christian era, they had to share the profits of ocean trading with the Arabs and Chinese, both of whom kept diaries and have left more illuminating information than have the Indian Argonauts" (*Towards Angkor*, pp. 27-30).

The French naturalist Henri Mouhot, the first European to discover Angkor, shows the mistake of fixing dates to its buildings by writing: "all traces of its history have passed into oblivion, though tradition maintained it had been the capital of a country that counted a hundred and twenty kings, and an army of five million soldiers." Mouhot found that the inscriptions on the walls of Angkor were indecipherable to the natives of Cambodia and says that when asked who founded the city, they invariably gave one of the four answers: "It is the work of the king of the Angels, my lord"; "it is the work of giants"; "we owe these buildings to the Leper King"; or finally, "they built themselves"^[41] (*Escape with Me*, pp. 56-7).

At the words "Leper King," imagination stirs again—Can it be that Naram-Sin contracted leprosy in the pestiferous forests of Cambodia? A legend recorded by M. de Beerski says that the Cambodian king was intentionally infected with the disease in revenge for his cruelty. Did Cain's son return to the land of his birth, hoping to regain his health only (as before suggested) to meet with a tragic death?

In *Escape with Me*, the author helps to support my theories by stressing the fact that so little Indian influence can be seen in the Angkor buildings and so much resemblance to those of Ur, Babylon and Nineveh, and the great cities of Persia and Assyria, through which, he considers, Imperial Rome, Constantinople and Venice were descended. Remarking that Angkor reminded him of Versailles and a certain Italian palace, he ends by saying with reference to the Angkor ruins as a whole: "though plainly they reached Cambodia, through Indian sources they were not in themselves of Indian origin," but of "one more remote in time" (*ibid.*).

The last words encourage the suggestion that Naram-Sin governed for a time Cain's colony in the Indus Valley, the first Viceroy in history—before he decided to seek further east, in unknown lands, room in which to build up an empire for himself.

Since Henri Mouhot was not looking, as we are, for signs that an almost supernatural being had founded Angkor and built Angkor Vat, he naturally concluded that the comparatively modern-looking edifice, so different from the rest, was built later than the more primitive, though huge buildings, in Angkor of one of which he writes:—

"Taste was already developed, but ingenuity, will-power, and motive power were almost lacking. In short the Mount Keng appears to have been one of the preludes to this civilisation, as Angkor Vat must have

been its crowning glory." (Quoted in *Escape with Me*, p. 23).

Some seventy years later Sir Osbert Sitwell visited Angkor and formed the same conclusion as Mouhot had done. He says that were Angkor Vat older than the far more primitive buildings, Angkorean architecture "would be the reverse of all other culture ... in that beginning with delicate sophisticated work, similar let us say to the creations of the Louis XVI period in France, it would end five hundred years later with grand primitive conceptions such as the Bayon,^[42] which everywhere else would mark an earlier development of building " (*ibid.*, p. 91).

Considering, however, the exquisite works from the Ur Cemetery now in the British Museum and assigned by Sir Leonard Woolley to the fourth millenium B.C. and reckoning "the falling off in art" recorded by Professor Kittel as taking place in the third millenium B.C., it seems reasonable to credit the founder of Angkor (whom I identify with Cain's son) with the erection of Angkor Vat and the more primitive buildings to his imitators or successors. To me the photograph of Angkor Vat taken from the air, suggests an enormous fantastic mansion of modern times, designed by some architectural genius, regardless of expense, by order of an eccentric millionaire. M. de Beerski might well write "Angkor Vat is the architectural Zenith reached by the Kh-mers; no Zenith was ever loftier" (*Angkor*, p. 251).^[43]

Why Sir Osbert Sitwell limits the period between the Bayon and Angkor to 500 years I know not; but if, as Dr. Wales believes, the gigantic faces on the Bayon's towers represent the Buddha who was born as late as the 6th or 14th century B.C., about 3,000 years must have elapsed between their respective erections. Possibly the "Bayon" was an attempt made by Naram-Sin's followers to imitate Angkor Vat. The faces in the photograph reproduced in Dr. Wales's book are not like other portraits of the "Great Ascetic." The enormous over-decorated "Borobudur" of Java also suggests in its photograph an imitation of Angkor Vat.^[44] A Javanese expert writes about it: "There is here no nervous tension, no concentration of force, to be compared with that which so impresses the observer of Angkor Vat (*Towards Angkor*, p. 202).

According to Tcheou-Ta-Koun, one of the Chinese merchants mentioned by Dr. Wales, Angkor was flourishing in the 13th century A.D., when the Diarist spent a year in that city. He describes a royal procession composed of cavalry, elephants, goat-cars and horse chariots, hundreds of girls carrying tall lighted candles, and says that everywhere he saw flowers and parasols ornamented with gold. He wrote: "Those who see the king must prostrate themselves and touch the ground with their foreheads. If they do not they are seized by the lictors who do not let them go without payment" (*Towards Angkor*, p. 234).

The Chinaman continues: "Everybody from the king downwards, both men and women, wear the chignon and leave the shoulders bare." Thus commemorating Cain, I imagine, designedly or innocently, for in Sargon's bas-relief portraits both fashions are seen.

The worthy Tcheou-Ta-Koun—as gossipy a diarist as Samuel Pepys—has more to relate which fits in with my theories: "The citizens of Angkor told him that every night the spirit of a nine-headed serpent in the form of a woman visited the king in his private tower and that, if he failed to be there, misfortune to the nation followed while if the snake-woman did not appear the king died" (*ibid.*, page 213). This garbled story of our first mother shows she was not forgotten. The Diarist describes how the King of Angkor, in his time, wore armour and carried the sacred sword of Cambodia which is still preserved in Siam by the Brahman priests; its very name Phra Khan, suggests its connection with Cain (*ibid.*, p. 232).

Dr. Wales says that Tcheou-Ta-Kouan visited Angkor at the close of the thirteenth century, "just before the curtain was finally rung down on the stirring drama of Greater India" (*ibid.*, p. 229). Sir Osbert Sitwell suggests that: "Probably the end of this civilisation was a massacre ... the enslaved people rising together with some neighbouring war-like tribe against their masters" (*Escape with Me*, p. 97).

From Indian inscriptions (none earlier than the Christian era be it remembered) Dr. Wales gathered much about a young Indian prince who was said to have gone forth, whence it is not told, with the avowed intention of conquering the world: "It seems very likely" the Doctor writes, "that it was this young prince who reached the Malay Peninsula soon after the middle of the eighth century," and landing most probably at Takuapa, made his way with his followers (who included four of his brothers) across the Transpeninsular route. The Anno Domini date Dr. Wales assigns to the young prince, I take the liberty of ignoring; from all else he tells us about the prince I assume that his story echoed in India down three milleniums and is more or less that of Naram-Sin.

Picturing the Prince as a "striking and romantic personage" the "greatest of the Indian Argonauts" the Doctor writes:—

"At last, a hero emerges whose glorious deeds are brought to life, once more, as modern research painfully pieces together the all too fragmentary records of a forgotten past. This great conqueror, whose achievements can only be compared with those of the greatest soldiers known to western history ... in a decade or two built up a vast maritime empire which endured for five centuries, and made possible the marvellous flowering of Indian art and culture in Java and Cambodia Yet in our encyclopædias and histories, one will search in vain for a reference to this far-flung empire or to its noble founder" (*ibid.*, p.167).

The name of this prince, Dr. Wales remarks, is not known probably because it was tabu (forbidden) to refer to the personal name of Indian kings, but, the Doctor says: "If we cannot give a name to our hero, at least we have no lack of grandiose epithets." In the Indian Inscriptions he is known as "the Sailendra," which means "King of the Mountain" ... and the east-flowing river by which he reached the Bay of Bandon bears to this day the name Girirashtra ... "the River of the Kingdom of the Mountain" To the Arab merchants, who began from the middle of the ninth century (A.D.) to write their travels, the prince is known as the "Maharaja, King of the Mountain and Lord of the Isles" (*ibid.*, p. 171).

Dr. Wales showed that the Prince established in Angkor a religion to which the name of "Sailendra" was given and that, in it, Siva was and is still, sometimes called in Brahmanism the "Royal God." If, as I believe, Naram-Sin invented the religion by making a god of Cain, he was only imitating Cain's artificial cult in which Adam, Eve and Abel were deified. Imitation can be seen, too, in the fact that while in Babylonian mythology Cain's double, Merodach, was given a duplicate called Adar or Ares who is said to have murdered Tammuz, the mythological representative of Abel, so in India Siva was given a double named Vishnu; and as Dr. Wales shows, the two gods were sometimes represented as one, and then were called Hari-Hara. This reminds us again of the modern story of Jekyll and Hyde for, while the images of Vishnu wear a pleasant smile and carry innocent toys in their hands, those of Siva wear a most malignant grin and carry lethal weapons.^[45]

It is very evident that the ancient mythologizers loved hinting at the facts they were obscuring. In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th Ed., Vol. IV, p. 385), I find that Siva was given two synonymns, the first being "Rudra" which means "Terrible as a wild beast," clearly referring to Cain's cruel nature, and reminding us of the carvings of the ruler with a spear already described. The second synonym is "Kapardin" and is said to mean "hair spirally braided, like a shell": which recalls at once, of course, the metal head dug up at Nineveh and tentatively identified by Professor Mallowan as the portrait of Sargon of Akkad.

By the year 1936 Dr. Quartich Wales's researches had convinced him that the Indian Argonauts, as he terms them, had travelled to Cambodia over the Indian Ocean, the Malay Peninsula, and the Gulf of Siam, halting for a time to prepare boats at the Bay of Bandon, on the site of a place now known as Chaiya. In the said year, therefore, the Doctor set out accompanied by his wife to follow in the footsteps of the Indians, attended through the Malay Peninsula by armed Siamese peasants with ponies, bullock-carts and one baggage elephant. He was the first British archæologist to probe the mystery of the long hidden city of Angkor.

Landing from the Indian Ocean in the Bay of Takuapa, he followed the river of that name through miles of tiger-haunted jungle along an almost unbeaten track towards the Bay of Bandon, meeting on the way with two illuminating experiences which, I cannot help saying, meant less to him than they do to me.

The first experience was his meeting with a troop of strolling Indian actors in a small village where he encamped for the night. The play they were performing was called "Manora," or simply "Norah," and he gives his opinion that it is perhaps the oldest of all plays, brought into the Peninsula by the "Indian Argo-nauts," signs of whom he was seeking. One of the chief parts in the play was, it seems, that of a "Naga King," who was said to live at the bottom of a lake, and sometimes to come up "to indulge in fasting and meditation on the bank under a great forest tree" (*ibid.*, p. 62).

Dr. Wales explains that "Nagas" were "serpents of the nether regions" and leaves it at that; but to me this fleeting vision of a "Naga King" is positive proof that Babylonians from the Indus Valley had passed that way.

Further across the Peninsular, in a bend in the river, the Doctor came upon what he describes as one of the most interesting sights he had ever seen. He writes:—

"There in the jungle were three large Hindu images, one female and two male, which were partly engulfed by the twin stems of a great jungle tree. Presumably they had, at a remote period, been laid on the bank, and at a later time someone had propped them up against the stem of a sapling, which had subsequently grown up and partially enveloped them" (p. 48-9).^[46]

By recognizing one of the male figures as that of Siva, because of a human skull hanging from his ear-ring, Dr. Wales invites the inference that the fierce-looking female, seated between the two recumbant male images, represents the Great Mother, and that the second male figure represents Vishnu, the duplicate of Siva.

According to Dr. Wales, Siva and Vishnu (in one) (p. 86) are sometimes identified with Brahma who, another authority writes, is merely a theological abstraction, so "Hari-Hara" may be regarded as the soul of the "Sailendra" (or Sivaite) religion, the grim background of Brahmanism.

Rash though this claim may seem, put forward by an amateur, there are scientific reasons for making it. For example, in an article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* an expert shows that "Brahma is completely the product of priestly speculation," and says he wonders how it could have "found a place in the heart of the people generally" (11th ed., "Brahmanism," p. 379).

Sometimes, it seems, Brahma gets left out altogether and is supplanted by Naram-Sin, for Dr. Wales tells us that in Bangkok, the capital of Siam, he found in one enclosure three small temples dedicated respectively to Vishnu, Siva and the "elephant-headed god Ganesha, son of Siva" (*ibid.*, p. 78). Who could this son of Siva represent but Naram-Sin?

When Dr. Wales reached the Bay of Bandon he found many ruins of brick buildings which he ascribes to the Indian "Argonauts," but says that many of them had been built over later by Buddhists. One building, looking like a shrine, was situated on a little natural hill and this he suggests, may have enjoyed peculiar sanctity as symbolizing THE Mountain, the one which gave the King of the Mountain his title, the Kailasa, or "Mountain of the Gods."

According to the Doctor the worship of Siva (the Sailendra or Sivaite cult) reached its highest development in Cambodia where, he explains: "the flatness of the land required artificial mountains for the reception of the "Royal God" on whom the welfare of the kingdom depended" (*ibid.*, pp. 190-191).

These remarks support my already expressed belief that all the stone buildings in Angkor were palaces, not temples. Probably they were designed by Cain's younger sons—less gifted architects than Naram-Sin.

The religion established in the Bay of Bandon by the Sailendra, lingers on in parts of what was once his empire. It is supported by both Brahmans and Buddhist priests, the former being known in Bali as Padandas who, it seems, impart secret knowledge to aspirants to the priesthood, whether Brahman or Buddhist so naturally there is little difference in their ritual except that the Brahman wear long hair done up in chignons (like King Cain's in his bas-reliefs) and the Buddhists wear short hair. Presumably their instruments of ritual are the same.

Dr. Quaritch Wales says that a considerable number of Brahman priests (priests of Siva as they are called) are still retained to take part in the royal ceremonies of Siam, and are recruited from the Bay of Bandon, where, Dr. Wales writes, "there are families in whose veins runs the blood of Brahmans from India, though since no female ever accompanied the men it follows that the Indian is somewhat attenuated" (*Towards Angkor*, p. 77).

The silly, savage and senseless element Professor Max Müller detected in mythology is conspicuous in Brahmanism. In the first of the four stages which a Brahman must pass through before he is regarded as "divine," he is taught that he may ask almost anything and even presumably take it by force; for he is exempt from corporal and capital punishment.

As before quoted, Dr. Wales writes: "the little island of Bali is the last outpost of living Hinduism that has survived the Islamic invasion of the East Indies, and the higher castes of the present inhabitants "represent the survival of the Indian Colonists, the rest of the inhabitants being really the descendants of the original inhabitants of the land." Presumably, therefore, the "Sudras" of Bali represent ancient "food-gatherers" of whom Mr. Perry writes in his *Children of the Sun*, "while the Brahman priests who act as parish priests are directly descended from the "food-producers."

In *Towards Angkor*, one reads that: "no Court ceremony took place in Bangkok without the assistance of the Brahman priests." A yearly ceremony is described in which young men dressed as 'Nagas' (many-headed snakes), played the most active part while "the role of Siva was acted by a nobleman chosen for the occasion by the king. He came in procession dressed with every god-like attribute, and for several days was regarded as a temporary king" (*ibid.*, p. 80). Dr. Wales also writes of a Siamese ceremony held at the beginning of the ploughing season and called "the First Ploughing"; in it the minister of Agriculture being dressed as a god or temporary king, and guiding the ceremonial plough drawn by decorated oxen. He was followed by a number of old ladies who scattered from their baskets consecrated seed (*ibid.*).

Up to the present century the same yearly ceremony took place in China, with the Emperor guiding the plough.

From time immemorial the Serpent has been worshipped and carried in processions round the cities. Can it be doubted that the Brahman priests know as much about Cain and his Mother as we learn from the Bible?

In China, in Imperial times, the same ploughing ceremony was enacted in what was called "a field of God," the reigning Emperor guiding the plough. Was not Cain "a tiller of the ground"? (Genesis iv, 2).

Again, in Chinese cities, enormous serpents were solemnly carried in procession; ... while in Cambodia the kings knelt humbly before the image of the serpent in times of national trouble; in China, a writer tells us, on one occasion the Emperor launched an edict against the Serpent, condemning him to perpetual exile and the sentence was beginning to be carried out when "the supreme courts of Peking, touched with compassion, went in a body to throw themselves at the feet of the Emperor and ask pardon for the poor Devil" (*Chinese Empire*, H. Huc).

Well, the Prophet Jeremiah warns us that the golden cup of Babylon would make the nations mad; the crazy practices of eastern lands may well be thought to fulfil that prophecy (Jeremiah li, 7).

It has already been suggested that "the Leper King," the Cambodians spoke about to Henri Mouhot, was the Naram-Sin of Babylonian inscriptions and M. de Beerski adds colour to that idea. Sent by his government, to report upon their newly-found possession of Angkor, he spent much time among the amazing ruins. He relates

how he stood before the stone statue of the "Leper King" at Angkor Vat, primed with a terrible tale told by a Cambodian guide in which the King is said to have been forcibly infected with leprosy in revenge for one of his cruel acts and how, shut out of his palace, he died on the terrace now known as that of the leprous king, crouching alone and starving. The native's tale is so circumstantial that, beside it, my theory of Naram-Sin's return to Ur and being buried there seems futile. There is so much reason to think that Cain's son Naram-Sin spread Cain's artificial religion, with slight alterations, in the Cambodian empire that any light thrown upon the "Leper King," who may quite well have been he, should be acceptable. M. Jeannerat de Beerski's book upon Angkor encourages speculation upon the subject. Giving a reproduced drawing of the statue of the "Leper King" which he saw at Angkor upon what is known as the terrace of the Leprous King, the French writer calls it a "satanic figure" and writes:—

"The stone monarch is absolutely naked, his hair is plaited and he sits in the Javanese fashion. The legs are too short for the torso, and the body forms, much too rounded, lack the strong protuberance of manly muscles, but, however glaring these defects he has many beauties, and as a study of character he is perhaps the masterpiece of Khmer sculpture. Whilst his body is at rest his soul boils within him He is not the wretched creature stung bitterly by the shafts of agony and mortification, but the wicked noble at the time of his greatness. His features are full of passion, with thick lips, energetic chin, full cheeks, aquiline nose and clear brow. He sneers, and never has ignominy of mind been more clearly expressed ... the mouth, slightly open, showing teeth, and the eyes seeming to gloat over the shame of a fallen and hated foe" (p. 175).

M. de Beerski says that "Gold leaves have been pasted on the statue's forehead and that a village girl is sometimes seen praying to it; a sign, surely, that the belief that the Leper King founded Angkor is deeply rooted in Cambodian minds.

Now that Sanskrit documents, once jealously guarded by the Brahman priests of Bali, are in European hands more important evidence can be expected. My great hope is that some younger writer will take up this enquiry—remembering that the modern word "Khmer" only means the same thing as "Cambodian," also that the Anno Domini dates sometimes boldly offered for the Angkor ruins are purely conjectural and that we have Dr. Wales' admission that archæology can tell us nothing about Angkor before the second century of the Christian era (*Towards Angkor*, p. 7).

As I see things, archæology, through ignoring the Genesis story, has lost its way. Were ever truer words written by man than these: "All discoveries come from above and are meant to confirm more strongly the truths contained in the sacred writings"? Can it be that we, of this scientific age, are witnessing the fulfilment of a Bible prophecy? Solemn, and strange, its words run through my mind like this:

"I am the Lord that maketh all things ... that turneth wise men backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish" (Isaiah xlv, 25).

Why, one wonders, should "wise men" be thus punished? Is it because, in this Christendom of ours, scholars have so little valued words spoken by Jesus to His disciples on the mount of olives have they quite forgotten that the Hebrew word "Torah," which He used, means the first five books of the Bible, and that "Genesis" is the first of them? The words of Jesus are these:—

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew v, 17-18).

Appendix

Pre-Adamites

In the last century it was thought wrong to suggest the existence of pre-Adamites, so common was the belief that the Bible taught that Adam was the first human being. But at least one Christian philosopher (Professor Dominick MacCausland, Q.C.) published his belief in their existence, and since finishing this book I have met with and read his most informative work. *Adam and the Adamite*,^[47] in which he points (as I have done in the preface of this book) to the fourth chapter of Genesis, as proving that Cain knew of pre-Adamites, feared them, and was granted a divine "mark" as a protection against them.

Professor MacCausland begins his work with the words: "To uphold the cause of revealed religion and vindicate the Bible in its integrity, is the first duty of the believer," and, up to verse 26 of Genesis i, he successfully fulfils the duty by showing how perfectly the Bible story of Creation is supported by discoveries made by geologists deep down below the ground now known to us.

Arriving at verse 26, however, he fails to strengthen his claim regarding pre-Adamites by announcing that it refers to Adam—not to pre-Adamites—as I hope to show it does.

While, therefore, in all other translations, are found the words "God said: Let us make man in our image," Professor MacCausland chose to change the word "man" into "Adam" and though philology teaches us that the words "man" and "Adam" are synonymous, the change raises difficulties; for example, the next verse ends with the words: "so God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female created he them" (Genesis i, 27).

Reflecting on the last words, one wonders how the Professor, certain as he felt that there must have been human beings before Adam, could have avoided the conclusion that the verses mentioned above referred to them. The following words leave no room for doubt that MacCausland understood the two records to be one and the same. He writes:

"In the Book of Genesis there are two records of the origin of Adam. The first announces his appearance as the crowning work of the creation; the other supplies a more special detail of the time, place and circumstances of his advent to the earth."

If, however, the inspired writer of Genesis had really recorded the appearance of Adam in Chapter i, could he have written in Chapter ii: "There was not a man to till the ground," for was not Adam the first gardener? In Chapter ii we read: "The Lord planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed," and further on come the words: "the Lord God took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it" (verse 15). Further on we learn that Adam was alone in the garden; and the Lord said: "It is not good for the man to be alone; I will make him an help-meet for him." Yet, as we saw, in Chapter i come the words: "male and female created he them." Again, I ask, how could these two records have been thought to refer to the same act of creation?

Pondering over these first chapters of the Bible, their seeming contradictions and the apparently casual remark that "there was not a man to till the ground," light flashes, as it were, from the seventh verse of the second chapter in which are recorded the formation of Adam and the divine gift to him of "a living soul" (words said to mean Reflective or Intellectual life—Ferrer Fenton, Footnote to Genesis ii.).

For, turning back to Chapter i, vv. 26-30, one notices, perhaps for the first time, that the supreme gift of a living soul is not said to be given to the first created men and women, who may, therefore, be regarded as inferior in intelligence to Adam and incapable of tilling the ground.

Within the last hundred years excavations all over the world have revealed the existence, during countless centuries, of an unintelligent race possessing no civilization or culture of any kind. Can it be doubted that these were the men and women who, the Bible has been telling, us all along, were created before God formed Adam?

Why the Almighty created these inferior people is not for us to ask. A warning to that effect comes through the Israelitish prophet Isaiah in the words:—

"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord, For as the heavens are higher than the earth so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts" (chapter lv, vv. 8-9).

Professor MacCausland who, for one, realised the value of Cain's story as the proof of the existence of pre-Adamites, deplored the fact that certain eminent Christian scholars, clinging to their early teaching that Adam was the ancestor of the human race, and disturbed by the discovery of prehistoric remains, felt forced to ignore the antediluvian chronology of the Bible as unintelligible and to antedate the birth of Adam some thousands of years at the least (*Adam and the Adamite*, p. 8).

" But," MacCausland argues, "if the Bible does not establish the date of Adam's birth and the genealogy of his descendants as there recorded, no reliance can be placed on it as evidence of any particular that it reveals of his and their existence and early history. The whole fabric of the revelation must collapse, and leave us without any trustworthy testimony of the origin and progress of Adam's race in the early stages of their existence."

Happily, as shown in my previous pages, the outrageously early dates invented by last century scholars for the earliest traces of civilization have been shelved in favour of the date 4000 B.C. almost exactly the same as that calculated some two centuries ago by Bishop Ussher, for Adam's birth. In *Human History* published in 1930 by Professor Elliot Smith the words occur "About 4000 B.C. men first began to build up the civilization we enjoy to-day" (p. 72).

Well has it been written "Chronology is the backbone of history." We now possess a scientific background for the oldest historical events known to us: it behoves us to make this fact known.

Science has had much to say upon the subject of pre-Adamites—under, of course, the name of "Primitive Man"—for the buried human remains are never connected with the Bible. Science is satisfied, however, that they inhabited the world for at least a million years; and the memorials they have left behind go to confirm all that we can gather from the first chapters of Genesis, in which the first people created are not, like Adam, said to have received the inestimable gift of intellect.

In *Prehistoric Man*, published in 1920 by the late Professor Scott Elliot, the said memorials—rudely carved objects of flint or stone—are called "eoliths" and are believed by the author to be the work of man, some of them as weapons of defence against huge carnivorous beasts whose bones were dug up near the human remains. They also served no doubt for killing smaller animals for food.

Scott Elliot never doubted that the "eoliths" were man's work although, he says, "public derision followed the announcement of that decision," and efforts were made to account for them in some other way. In support of his view, he quotes a foreign expert, one M. Rutot, who claimed that the eoliths could be used as "hammers, knives, razors, scrapers, awls, or throwing-stones" and he argues that "it is not disputed that most of the eoliths fit themselves conveniently to the hand nor that man could have produced the marks which they show." Indeed (he says) "Mr. Reid Moir and M. Rutot have actually made eoliths closely resembling actual specimens. Nor is there any dispute as to their being of real benefit to our ancestor if they were really made by him" (*Prehistoric Man*, p. 29).

The Professor remarks shrewdly: "If there is little to prove that eoliths were made by man, there is even less to convince us that they were formed in any other way. Living races like the Seri Indians and the extinct Tasmanians did, as a matter of fact, use just such rudely chipped stones. It seems likely that the first men frequented those woods which were on the sea shore or on the margin of the lower lakes." He pictures what he calls our hypothetical fore-runner" in a humid semi-tropical climate—"coming out in the morning, gathering

nuts and smashing shell-fruit with stones or eoliths, and lastly retiring at night to the branches of trees where he slept upon a rudely entangled mass of twigs" (p. 27).

In 1930, *Human History*, by the late Professor Elliot Smith was published. On page 72 he writes: "It is only about 81 years since the discovery of human remains that do not belong to the same species as ourselves. Since 1848, however, a sufficient number of fossils remain—most of them tantalisingly fragmentary—but all belonging to the same zoological species" Although some skulls have been dug up quite distinct from the *Homo Sapiens*—those were the skulls largely responsible for the Darwinian theory that our first ancestor was an anthropoid ape. By his words "*Homo Sapiens*" meaning intelligent or thinking man, the Professor recalls the 26th and 27th verses of Genesis in which we read of men and women created in the image of God, who, blessed and given dominion over the whole animal world, were not given the supreme gift of intelligence or reflective thought afterwards bestowed upon Adam.

Beautiful those men and women must have been, however, made in the image of God and with daughters so fair that the rebellious spirits expelled from heaven took them as wives, and their sons became giants or monsters, as the Hebrew word also means^[48] (Genesis iv).

We may, assume, though the Bible does not say so, that the descent of the wicked angels upon earth, recorded in Genesis vi, took place before the formation of Adam, and that it was the reason why God planted the Garden of Eden, in which to isolate Adam and Eve so that they might found a "thinking" race capable of resisting all evil influence.

Excavation in the ruins of Nineveh brought to light in the last century the best possible evidence to the truth of the Bible story of the rebellious angels. This was nothing less than an obvious parody of the story, inscribed upon a tablet of clay translated by Professor Sayce and quoted in this book. We also have St. Jude's indictment of the rebellious angels. In his Epistle he writes that "The angels which kept not their first estate but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in ever-lasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great Day."

The most materialistic sceptics must see the weight of this evidence from both the Bible and the Babylonian tablet. To my mind, anthropology is helpful here: Professor Elliot Smith devotes pages in *Human History*, to the story of the archaic "Golden Age" and its deterioration which he believed to be based upon true history and which I believe to be based upon the true history of the pre-Adamites mentioned in the Bible.

He says that the ancient Greeks referred to the simple happy life of primitive people as the "Golden Age." It was commonly assumed that the acceptance of the belief in this theory implied the degradation of mankind, for, obviously, the state in which the philosophers found men actually living implied a falling away from the high virtues of the "Age of Gold" (*Human History*, p. 180).

Elliot Smith mentions modern scholars who refused to believe in the historical basis of the tradition, in spite, as he says, of the eloquent witnesses of its reality provided by the ruins of the ancient glories in Egypt and Western Asia, Cambodia, Java and Central America, and of the later loss of useful arts, etc. (*ibid.*).

The ruins of ancient glories cannot, of course, be ascribed to the first created men who were incapable of building anything, as shown in this appendix. Therefore, they can be ascribed to Cain and his sons, who founded China. According to my lights, it was around the first created people that the Chinese tradition, of the "Golden Age" and its deterioration grew up. I believe that the story of those people was told to Cain by his mother, who was his instructress in everything, as the Babylonians knew.

The Professor quotes, as follows, the Chinese philosopher Kwang-Tze (604-532 B.C.) who, he says, was "writing of the world ages and the Taoist religion of his master, as saying:—

"In the age of perfect virtue men attached no value to wisdom. They were upright and correct without knowing that to be so was Righteousness; they loved one-another without knowing that to do so was Benevolence; they were honest and leal-hearted without knowing it was Loyalty; they fulfilled their engagements without knowing that to do so was Good Faith."

The Chinese philosopher continues: "After Fu-hi and other sovereigns disturbed the harmonies of heaven and earth, the manners of the people from being good and simple became bad and mean" (*Human History*, p. 182).

It seems likely that, unknown to this follower of a long line of Chinese philosophers, the Emperor Fu-hi of this story represented Cain, for (as shown in Chapter 10,) there is good reason to regard the Chinese Empire as founded by Cain's sons, after they separated from Cain on his departure towards the Tigris.

Scholars have encouraged this theory. MacCausland quotes M. Huc, who wrote:—

"Chinese civilization originated in an antiquity so remote that we vainly endeavour to discover its commencement They seem to have always been living in the same stage of advancement as in the present day and the data are such as to confirm that opinion" (*Adam and the Adamite*, p. 265).

Again, M. Huc writes:—

"This incapacity to change, leads to the conclusion that they were instructed and incapable of being instructors either of themselves or others in the civilization which they have acquired Their remarkable talent for imitation ... is a mere animal instinct in as much as its exercise has done nothing to elevate the Chinese mind above the level it had attained before they first entered China" (*ibid.*).

On page 43 of this book a Babylonian text is quoted, proving that the people of Babylon and Nineveh knew that King Cain's mother had taught him all she knew. With her supernaturally acquired knowledge, she may well have known all about the men and women created before Adam and their deterioration under the influence of the rebellious angels. That Cain was afraid of the blameless people the Chinese philosopher describes, is obviously incredible. A change must have come over them and, in Genesis vi, although that chapter seems to confuse two events, we seem to find what the change was. Rendered by Monseigneur Knox, the chapter begins "Time passed and the race of men began to spread over the face of the earth and now the sons of God^[49] saw how beautiful were the daughters that were born to them and took them as wives, and their own children became giants or monsters."^[50] In the following verses we are told that God found "that earth was full of man's iniquities and that the whole frame of their thoughts was set continually on evil." It was then that God deprived the men before Adam of immortality, limiting their lives to 120 years (*The Old Testament in English*—Mgr. Knox).

The Tree of Life—it will be remembered—was in the Garden of Eden, but when driven thence, as their punishment for eating the forbidden fruit of the tree of Knowledge, Adam and Eve too lost immortality. In Genesis iii, 22 and 23, God says:—

"Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live for ever. Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken."

A Babylonian carving that witnesses to the authenticity of this Bible story can be seen in *Chaldean Genesis* by the late G. Smith of the British Museum, and the carving itself is in the British Museum. It represents two Cherubim guarding the Gate of Eden after the expulsion of Adam and Eve.

To the evil interference of the rebellious angels with God's creation, I venture to ascribe the worst specimens of humanity now known to us. Those rebellious spirits live on, indeed—as St. Jude tells us—until the great day.

May we not hope that myriads of their once helpless victims will gather in the Holy City where runs the river with the Tree of Life on this side and on that bearing its "monthly fruits and its leaves" for the healing of the nations (last chapter of St. John's Revelations, Verse 2; Mgr. Knox's translation).

Notes

1. ↑ *Buried Empires*, Patrick Carleton, published 1939. ("An Author who knows his subject, not only from the archaeological side but also from that other, the linguistic."—*Times Lit. Sup.* July, 1939.)
2. ↑ *Hibbert Lectures*, Sayce. Deputy Professor of comparative philology, Oxford. Hon. LL.D. Dublin. Queens Coll., Oxford.
3. ↑ His contemporary portrait statue is in Iraq. A photograph of it is given in *The Golden Carpet* by S. de Chair: (Faber and Faber).
4. ↑ *Makers of Civilisation*, Dr. Waddell, LL.D., C.B., C.I.E.
5. ↑ *Babylonian Excavations and Early Bible History*, Kittel. Published 1903.
6. ↑ *Makers of Civilisation*, Dr. Waddell.
7. ↑ *Sumer of Akkad* (p. 242), L. King.
8. ↑ First mentioned in Genesis v. 32.
9. ↑ In *Makers of Civilisation*, p. 497, Dr. Waddell writes: "The Sumerians never called themselves by that title nor were they ever so known, except by Assyriologists."
10. ↑ See Appendix at end of this book.
11. ↑ *Babylonlan and Oriental Excavations*, Kittel, p. 60.
12. ↑ Illustrated in George Smith's book, *The Chaldean Genesis*.
13. ↑ "The Old City." *Chaldean Genesis*, p. 55. "The Place of the Settlement." *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 185. Professor Sayce writes: "The name of Unuk is found on the oldest bricks and is the same as Enoch built by Cain" (Index, *Hibbert Lectures*).
14. ↑ Müller, *Ency. Brit.* 11th ed. "Mythology." "The Greeks, borrowing most of their astronomical knowledge from the Babylonians, held similar myths and ideas—the Romans adopted the Greek ideas." (*Ency. Brit.* 11th ed. "Canis Major").
15. ↑ *Makers of Civilisation*, pp. 143-487.
16. ↑ Professor Elliot Smith writes: "About 4000 B.C. men first began to build up the civilization which we enjoy to-day." Note how Science happens to support Bishop Ussher: *Human History*, p.72, published 1939.
17. ↑ The Holy City of Marduk means Babylon.
18. ↑ Sargon made successful expeditions to Syria and Elam and with the conquered peoples of those countries he peopled Akkad. (Ragozin, quoted by Garnier, *Worship of the Dead*, p. 398).
19. ↑ Sargon says: "for ... years (the number of years is undecipherable though some writers venture to suggest it) the kingdom I have ruled and the black-heads I have governed. In multitudes of bronze chariots I rode over rugged lands" (*Chaldea*, Ragozin, pp. 205-207).
20. ↑ "Once a great brick-built city, strongly resembling the typically ruined cities of Babylonia" (*ibid.*, p. 142).
21. ↑ In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* we find that the word "noble" in Gallic is "ario" and in Sanscrit is "ary." (11th Edit.).
22. ↑ From intensive study of the dark people's language the late Bishop Caldwell concluded that "the pre-Aryans had indeed possessed kings, temples, cities, metal instruments, and written books" (*Buried Empires*, p. 140). Only in the last few years has his discovery been verified by excavations in Sargon's "Good Edin Land."
23. ↑ See later references to Mohenjo-Daro.
24. ↑ Diodorus Siculus (circa 44 B.C.) writes of the chief city of Egypt called by the Greeks Diosopolis (Thebes) but called by the Jews "Ham" and by the Egyptians Amon (*The Worship of the Dead*, Garnier, p. 16).
25. ↑ Colonel Garnier points out that the Scripture only mentions women who became the wives of some other family, and says that Plutarch infers that Naamah was the wife of Ham (*The Worship of the Dead*, p. 196).

26. ↑ "This Great Mother, at first with only vaguely defined traits, was probably the first deity that the wit of man devised to console him with her watchful care in this life, and to give him assurance as to his fate in the future." (Quoted in Perry's *Children of the Sun*, p. 216).
27. ↑ Professor Sayce's rendering of the name, rendered 'Ishtar' by other writers. "The Greeks, borrowing most of their astronomical knowledge from the Babylonians, held similar myths and ideas The Romans adopted the Greek ideas." *Ency. Brit.* 11th ed. "Canis Major." We are now told that the Egyptians also borrowed many of their legends from Babylonia (*Ur of the Chaldees*, p. 89).
28. ↑ In the *Historians' History of the World*, Vol. 1, p. 362, we read "It is probable that the first collection of astronomical observations and terrestrial omens were made for a library established by Sargon."
29. ↑ Similarity of Maya and Babylonian Art is referred to later.
30. ↑ See chapter 3. Dr. Waddell's remark quoted.
31. ↑ These "older temples" are referred to later.
32. ↑ About the Erech temples, Mr. Carleton says that one of them contained the oldest writing known while the other (dedicated to the Mother-goddess) contained three shrines for idols of which none were found. My suggestion is that Asshur-bani-pal's servants had taken them up to Nineveh.
33. ↑ Professor King says that the ruins of Eridu "appear to rise abruptly from the bed of an inland sea, which no doubt at one time was connected directly with the Persian Gulf; hence the description of Eridu in cuneiform literature as standing 'on the shore of the sea'" (*History of Sumer and Akkad*, p. 35.)
34. ↑ "Asari"—always used of Marduk as an epithet only, as in the tablet of fifty names (*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 1922, Sayce).
35. ↑ This name I assume was invented by the priests for Cain's daughter; the high-priestess superstition may have saved her tomb from sacrilege.
36. ↑ *Sumer and Akkad*, p. 242.
37. ↑ Genesis iii, 24.
38. ↑ Probably because its stonework and pyramidal central tower are in the style of the Great Pyramid of Gizeh. We read: "The stone is cut into great blocks fitted together with great accuracy without the use of cement." (*Ency. Brit.* 11th ed., "Angkor").
39. ↑ Cambodian king-fisher birds sold to the Chinese were the chief national income" (*Escape with Me*, p. 40).
40. ↑ "Mr. Thomas Gann adumbrates the interesting theory concerning a common origin for the Cambodian and Maya people" (*Escape with Me*, p. 102).
41. ↑ In M. de Beerski's book *Angkor* photographs are given of the statue of the Leper-King, also of a bas-relief of the Elephant God Ganesha who, it will be shown, represents Naram-Sin in mythology.
42. ↑ A photograph of the Bayon is printed on the first page of *Escape with Me*. Another is given on page 230 of *Towards Angkor*.
43. ↑ The word "Khmers" (a modern invention) is mystifying and only means Cambodians, a fact stressed by Sir Osbert Sitwell.
44. ↑ Both photographs can be seen in *Towards Angkor*.
45. ↑ The contrast between the images is very marked in a reproduced photograph in *Towards Angkor*, p. 154.
46. ↑ Picture in *Towards Angkor* (facing p. 48).
47. ↑ *Adam and the Adamite* was published in its fifth edition in 1882. Professor Sayce writes: "Adam in Hebrew as in Assyrian, means 'man' (*The First Book of Moses called Genesis*, Appendix). Professor Max Müller said: "Man, a derivative root, means to think. From this we have the Sanskrit Manu, originally the thinker, then man" (*Lectures*, Vol I, p. 425).
48. ↑ The Hebrew for giant or monster is "Nephilim" or "Rephaim." Some of them were still in Palestine and their appearance terrified the Israelites sent by Moses to spy the land.
49. ↑ Dr. Knox writes: "Sons of God appears to mean Angels in Job 1 and 2 and 38 v. 7, elsewhere its meaning is doubtful."
50. ↑ In Hebrew, synonymous words.